The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME 36 • FEBRUARY 1950 • NUMBER 1

RHETORIC AND GENERAL EDUCATION: A SYMPOSIUM CONTINUED

In the December 1949 issue we published a number of comments on Dean Hunt's provocative article by persons interested in General Education. Two of the replies were by members of the committee which submitted the Harvard report. We now publish eight additional comments. Two are by college presidents, one of whom, Dr. Hollinshead, also helped draft General Education in a Free Society. *One is by a professor of English and the remaining five are by teachers of speech.*

ROBERT W. MCEWEN *is president of Hamilton College, where one of the earliest Departments of Rhetoric and Oratory was established in 1841. Instruction in public speaking has been a requirement for all Hamilton students since 1812.* BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD *is president of Coe College at Cedar Rapids, Iowa.* PORTER G. PERRIN *is professor of English at the University of Washington and author of the Chicago Ph.D. dissertation on* The Teaching of Rhetoric in American Colleges before 1750 *(1936).* A. T. WEAVER *is chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of Wisconsin.* W. NORWOOD BRIGANCE *is chairman of the Department of Speech at Wabash College and in 1946 was president of the SAA.* KARL R. WALLACE *is chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of Illinois. Messrs. Weaver, Brigance, and Wallace are former editors of this* JOURNAL. EDWIN BURR PETTET *is Assistant Professor of Speech at Carleton College.* RALPH C. LEYDEN *is in charge of courses in communications at Stephens College.* EDITOR.

Dean Hunt's paper on Rhetoric and General Education in the October 1949 issue presents most effectively the central problem now facing college administrators and professors alike. Granted that the specialism of the past generation is recognized as an evil as well as a good, granted the loss of a sense of unity as the fruit of the free elective system, how do we proceed?

The seriousness of the problem is illustrated in the conviction held in so many departmental fields that the unifying and integrative discipline is certainly our own. 'The good man skilled in speaking' is certainly one good definition of the product desired. The philosopher would stress rather the man competent to deal with the riddles of the Sphinx in their contemporary forms and especially to recognize the inter-relationships of the riddles. The psychologist will phrase it in terms of the development of the total personality of the student.

Probably only a new and twentieth century Aristotle, a man not yet on the horizon, can put it all together again. But Dean Hunt shows us an important part of the way. Skill in speaking is meaningless except in the mouth of a good man. The skills of speaking are

therefore not ends in themselves. Nor does the professor of public speaking need to interpret this judgment as relegating him to an instrumental function. Rather he is a colleague in the fullest sense of the word, concerned as a specialist to aid his students develop their skill in speaking, concerned as a college professor to teach his students how to think straight about problems of central importance in our time.

I share completely Dean Hunt's counsel that the way forward is along the line of the Harvard report rather than the formulation of a professional body of knowledge centering in the form, usage, and meaning of words. The field of speech is now well established in our curricula. It need not adopt defensive techniques in order to prove its professional status.

ROBERT W. MCEWEN, *President*
Hamilton College

At some educational conference where I was speaking on the importance of general education a young man attacked me vigorously on the grounds that the Harvard Report didn't emphasize enough the importance of 'speech,' meaning speech departments. Beyond replying that I was only one of a committee, and that I thought the Report did give a very large place to 'communication,' I let the attack go. Now I discover that Everett Hunt, in his thoughtful article 'Rhetoric and General Education,' has given a better answer to that criticism than I could have given anyway.

The effort of the Harvard Report, it seems to me, was to talk about the 'good man skilled in speaking' and writing, and what changes in the curriculum would foster the development of such a person. As Hunt says, the small liberal arts college up to the turn of the century was not departmentalized. The growth of the elective system and the beginning of departments took away its former unity of purpose with its emphasis on the 'good man speaking or writing.' The distribution system was only a partial cure for this loss since many of the distribution courses were but courses to begin a specialty. The proposals made by the Harvard Committee were largely in the direction of giving sense to 'distribution,' though not many critics of the Report have seen that point.

But an even more important effort of the Report was to suggest the continuance of the spirit of general education into the junior and senior years with courses to be given there which were not specialized (at least vocationally specialized) but which were advanced. It is precisely here, I think, that we have lost ground in education. Many of the so-called professional schools, starting at the beginning of the junior year, are an almost fraudulent catering to the vocational desires of students or the equally undesirable anxiety of specialists themselves to be in a school of their own. The old liberal training with its majors confined to pure science, to the humanities, and to the social studies gave a specialized education in these subjects which often led back to general integration.

The answer to getting what we want by way of general or liberal education, in my view, is that there should not be a 'major' in speech in a small liberal arts college, but that speech should be combined with one of the traditional majors on some proportional basis. Even in a large university, speech seems hardly a major unless combined with drama, with literature, with a social study, or with a science.

The only excuse for such a major is to train teachers of speech who can do

remedial work in the high schools. But the clinical aspects of speech work, it seems to me, might well be left for graduate schools, for even speech majors, I would think, should have something to speak about.

Hunt's suggestion about a return to Aristotle is excellent. However, Aristotle is by no means the only writer to whom one may return to get back to a time when subjects were related; nor do I think the word, 'rhetoric,' means what it meant fifty years ago, though we do now need some reasonably accurate modern synonym for it.

In short, this is to applaud Dean Hunt's article. I haven't encountered many people in 'speech' with his point of view. Where are they to be found?

BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD, *President Coe College*

A reading of 'Rhetoric and General Education' in the JOURNAL for October 1949 carried me back to 'old, unhappy, far-off things, and battles long ago,' when young Lochinvar Hunt came out of the West and threw down his gauntlet to Woolbert and O'Neill. A third of a century has gone by since they opened their memorable debate on 'form' and 'substance.' It seems a pity that these pages from the past are not more accessible to the present generation of readers who would profit from considering Dean Hunt's current pronouncements in the context of these earlier siftings and winnowings.[1] To reconstruct the framework of the old controversy would require more space than is now available. All that seems feasible here is to set down four brief quotations expressing what I regard as the Dean's persistent theses and then venture a condensed comment on each.

1. '*The need for "good men skilled in speaking" is so fundamental in all societies that no educational plans can long neglect the obligation to train them.*'

If, as Hunt maintains, it always has been and now is generally recognized that the training of 'good men skilled in speaking' is the paramount objective of education, why is it that such institutions as Chicago, Harvard, Yale, and Swarthmore have been and still are notable for their neglect of this universal function? Much of the academic territory in which the oft-quoted Harvard Report is received as inspired scripture continues to be darkest Africa so far as Speech Education is concerned.

2. '*The most effective answer to this problem* [finding worthy content or substance for courses in writing or speaking] *I think is provided by the Harvard proposal to have the work in communication given not separately, but in connection with the courses in general education.*'

If this statement means that training in speech should be so related to the rest of the curriculum that students will write and talk intelligently, well and good. But if it implies that no special instruction is to be offered in speech *per se*, that is a horse of an entirely different hue. There is a considerable amount of evidence available to show that only when study and practice are focussed upon the elements of an art are its essential skills learned.

3. '*Such instructors* [teachers of writing and speaking] *would have to familiarize themselves with the specific content of these courses in general educa-*

[1] Academic Public Speaking, Volume 3, Number 1, January, 1917; An adventure in Philosophy, Volume 3, Number 4, October 1917; Adding Substance to Form in Public Speaking Courses, Volume 8, Number 3, June 1922; Knowledge and Skill, Volume 9, Number 1, February 1923; The Teaching of Speech as an Academic Discipline, C. H. Woolbert, Volume 4, Number 1, February 1923; Speech Content and course Content in Public Speaking, J. M O'Neill—ibidem.

tion, but beyond this their best professional training would be a familiarity with the ETHICS, POLITICS, POETICS, and RHETORIC of Aristotle.'

Surely no one would want the teacher of speech to be ignorant of the larger educational program of which his work is a part; he should be educated. Unquestionably, a study of classical rhetoric is valuable. But will anyone seriously contend that a general education, supplemented by a familiarity with Aristotle, is adequate preparation for the teaching of speech? Hunt does concede that Aristotle should be modernized by applications of psychology, anthropology, linguistics, and semantics. But what about bringing Aristotle down to date by using the results of research in voice science, pathology, phonetics, discussion, mass communication, interpretation, theatre, and other branches of the speech discipline?

4. *'He* [the teacher of speech] *must not himself become a technical specialist.'*

Again and again, through the years, Hunt has warned us against offering training in technique; skills should not be taught directly. If only we will cooperate with our academic colleagues in developing 'the good man,' somehow skill in speaking will be added unto him!

Many of us hold that, while we share with all other teachers the responsibility for training good men and women, our special contribution must be in helping them to become skilled in speaking. If we do not do that particular job, no one else will. As Professor O'Neill pointed out more than twenty-five years ago:

> Civilization itself consists largely in man's improvement in form, in technique, in knowing what to do with, how to treat, with what technique to handle the substance of the Universe. . . . Trying to substitute something else for our own work will profit us nothing. Our place in the academic dress parade will not be worth holding if we can hold it only by appearing in the shoes of economics, the cloak of politics, and the hat of philosophy.

Indeed, Hunt himself wrote in the same issue of the JOURNAL:[2]

> Knowledge and skill are so complementary that it is strange they should ever seem antithetical. . . . Skill is an important element in our work. We should defend its dignity.

In that faith and on that platform, we can face the future together.

A. T. WEAVER,
University of Wisconsin

Not even Everett Hunt can lift the Harvard Report on *General Education in a Free Society* above being sad mediocrity and a testament of the Harvard institutional mind. It ignores the ideas of John Dewey, who perhaps has had more influence on 20th Century America than any modern thinker (and one wonders whether Dewey would have been ignored had he been a Harvard product). It states with pride that it would free us from the tyranny of the present; but at the price of freedom it ignores except obliquely the problems of politics, economic security, labor, war, peace, scientific achievement, and international problems—vital living issues that face the educated man today. Its plan for general education faithfully hews the Party line: humanities, social sciences, natural sciences.

Whether this was a retreat of timid minds from the facts of life, or whether the power makers at Harvard compelled the committee to produce a new curriculum without altering the old campus balance of power, is beside the point. The result is the same. The report justifies the statement on it by former President MacCracken of Vassar: 'Whenever there is poor teaching and medio-

[2] QJS Volume 4, Number 1, February 1923.

cre living . . . you will find the professors clamoring for compulsion to make the students come back to their courses,' and the pithy summary by Philip Wylie: 'As an antidote for plutonium, they furnish Plato.'

Now Hunt has made one significant contribution. He has articulated the Report's groping toward 'the good man skilled in speaking' as the final test and unifying influence of general education. In one particular he has also rewritten the Report; 'The Harvard proposal,' he says, is 'to have work in communication given not separately, but in connection with the courses in general education.' I do not find quite that in the Report. The Report's wording instead is 'During the second term of the freshman year the work in *English composition* would be required of all students. It would be given, not separately, but in connection with the courses in general education then being taken by the student. The classes in *composition* would as classes, cease to meet.' (Report, p. 200. Italics mine.) Hunt's translation is what the authors of the Report *would have said* had they applied their statement of theory on Communication (pp. 67-68), but seemingly were prevented by the peculiar limitations of the Harvard institutional mind. Hunt's thesis is sound and beyond challenge that, 'The need for "good men skilled in speaking" is so fundamental in all societies that no educational plans can long neglect the obligation to train them.' It says what the framers of the Report (p. 68) wanted to say, but could not, or dared not, say when they came to the point (p. 200).

Hunt's belief, however, that such training can be given, 'not separately, but in connection with the courses in general education'—if I may speak frankly—simply denies the validity of history.

Even Aristotle, though he could produce most of the monumental work on rhetoric, could not quite as successfully produce the good man skilled in speaking as could Isocrates. Speaking broadly, Aristotle used Hunt's method. Isocrates did not. (Please, Everett, don't answer that Isocrates also taught rhetoric, not separately, but in connection with courses in general education. He really did not, as I would be glad to show with more words at my disposal.) What Aristotle could not do, I don't think I can do, nor can Hunt.

Again, *it was the concentration on rhetoric as a subject matter divorced from practice that gave birth to the rise of elocution in the 18th Century and split the field of speech asunder.* Suppose that every institution in America adopted Hunt's proposal to teach the good man skilled in speaking, not in separate courses but in connection with courses in Physical Science, Biology, Western Thought and Institutions, and Great Texts of Literature (which are the proposed Harvard courses for general education). What would happen? I will guarantee that after twenty years no genuine rhetoric would be taught in these courses, and after forty years no semblance of rhetoric would be taught. Just as the Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory at Harvard has been turned by easy stages into the Archibald MacLeish chair of poetry, so would these courses—already pressed for time to cover their vast scope of subject matter—give less time to the tough, time-consuming discipline of communication, and more time to their easier-to-teach 'content.'

Then once again—let us say about the year 1975—there would arise a 'new,' 'modern,' and 'scientific' school

of elocution to fill the void; and still again—let us say about the year 2,000—we teachers of speech would be forced to start over, back where we were in 1915, and set up separate courses for training the good man skilled in speaking.

Every time the hard-to-teach discipline courses are combined with the easier-to-teach content courses it always happens. If Hunt's proposal were adopted, it would follow the old track. On that I will bet the endowment of Wabash College against the endowment of Swarthmore College, winner take all in the year 2,000 A.D.

W. Norwood Brigance,
Wabash College

Dean Hunt has done well to remind us that in educational circles interest in speaking the mother tongue well is in inverse proportion to the amount of specialization which college education has deemed desirable—the greater the specialization the less interest in using English with distinction. He suggests that the movement called 'General Education' reveals a departure from excessive specialization and that accordingly college education may rediscover the values of speaking and writing well.

The correlation thus suggested is not to be dismissed lightly by either the educator or the teacher concerned with improving the use of the oral and written symbol. Yet it is possible that *college* education as compared to graduate education (professional and specialized endeavor with its emphasis upon research) has always reflected the activities and values of the society for which it seeks to prepare youth. It would appear, then, that a renaissance in rhetoric and public address must in part reflect social needs and values. And one of the great needs of society is improvement in communication, not only between specialists but among groups of all kinds.

Although it is both sound and proper to associate rhetoric with skill in communication and with the attainment of vocational, professional, social, and general educational goals, we should not let our preoccupation with communication entirely overshadow a fundamental fact: that the linguistic symbol is at bottom the great means of ordering and systematizing human experience and that 'mental' activity of the *human* animal and symbolization seem to be virtually synonymous. If educators would recognize the close correspondence between mental activity and symbolization, then speaking and writing—and indeed even activities employing nonlinguistic symbols, such as mathematics, music, and graphic arts—would be central to all formal education from the elementary school through the college. At the college level this would mean (1) that grammar, rhetoric, and logic would be integrated with social and humanistic studies at all levels and (2) that courses in rhetoric and public address would seek to develop precision and distinction in the use of the oral symbol. Instead of aiming only at adequacy of communication, as most of our courses in writing and speaking now do, we should be striving at refinement and distinction in thought-and-language. We would be concerned not merely with communication as tool and instrument; we would be concentrating on the peculiarly human aspect of the man, the communicator.

Karl R. Wallace,
University of Illinois

Dean Hunt's thesis that both society in general and education in particular (whether further labeled 'general' or

not) are now more aware of the activities that properly fall within the scope of rhetoric is one of the conspicuous facts of our time. I would like to add three comments in line with his reasoning:

1. That we do not lean too heavily upon Aristotle. Granted that he raised most of the right questions the answers should be in terms of our best current knowledge and against the background of our own social climate.

2. That the call is for rhetoric in the great not the small tradition, not for the techniques alone but for what might properly be called a philosophical rhetoric, involving as wide a range of subject matter and breadth of understanding, perhaps even of sympathy, as the teacher can muster.

3. That in our training of future teachers we keep in mind this broad ideal and do all in our power to send out generally—or truly—educated persons. As a basis for argument, I would propose that not much over half the graduate 'training' of a prospective teacher in the field of rhetoric, oral or written, should be in specific departments of Speech or English and that the rest should be in stimulating and mature fields that can illuminate him about man and all his works as they have been in the recent past and are today. The practice of 'a minor' as generally administered does not do the trick, since a minor is merely a subordinate specialization. A wider selection among supporting courses might draw the charge of thinness (as well as trade fears of lessening the number of frequently repetitive courses in our own field), but that could be met by the actual quality of the courses selected and their patent usefulness in developing teachers with the characteristics that we are currently demanding of our students. It is relatively easy these days to find teachers in our graduate departments for dramatics, radio, speech correction, and other specialisms—but where are the teachers with a genuine enthusiasm for extending the powers of general communication in young people?

PORTER G. PERRIN,
Universtiy of Washington

In a few pages Dean Hunt has struck at the heart of a problem that should have been a bother to speech educators long before this. The role of rhetoric in the liberal arts curriculum—or in general education (the distinction I believe to be one of means rather than ends)—is miscast so long as it performs within an area instead of among many areas.

Until college catalogues omit the statement that courses and activities in rhetoric are available for those 'interested in Public Speaking' and recognize the special disciplines within oral communication as indispensible to the 'good man,' skill in speaking will remain the specialty of a few—or what is worse—a popularized 'gut' for many. A public speaking course that encourages or tolerates a ten-minute speech on 'How to Press Pants' has failed to exploit the unique integrating function of its medium, and confuses the ends of personal ease and deportment with the purposes of communication which give those ends meaning.

Except for those who are to become teachers of speech or speech pathologists, the study of rhetoric has significance only when it is 'given not separately, but in connection with courses in general education.' If rhetorical training is to be anything more than preparation for salesmanship and the after-dinner-joke, it must be nothing less than

training in the discipline of accurate, artistic, effective and significant communication of the best thinking the 'good man' can produce.

Dean Hunt seems to believe that rhetoric can be most at home in general education. With the Harvard Report as his yardstick, he applauds general education for its efforts to humanize knowledge of the sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities. As a distinction to 'special' education, I approve of his (and the Harvard Report's) de-emphasis of specialization in education. So long as the stress in learning is upon how to acquire a living instead of acquiring a life worth living, the 'good man' will have a hard time appearing. But it seems to me the case for rhetoric is as strong in special as in general education. Its academic importance is not confined to an educational 'system.' My engineering students at Princeton some years ago were making highly interesting and probing talks on 'The Scientist's Philosophy of Life' while students in the liberal arts division were too-often content with 'The Fascination of Philately' or 'The Right Glasses for the Right Drinks.' It seems to me to matter not so much that education make science a subject for rhetorcial discourse as that rhetoric become the medium of scientific discourse—or any other meaningful discourse.

How to produce the 'whole man' is still an unsettled matter in my mind. I am not sure that conscious integration when it sacrifices (as it frequently must) study of material for awareness of relationships produces in many cases more than the 'superficial man.' But whatever the approach, certainly rhetoric, when properly understood and applied, is a most precious integrating ingredient in all education. And to apply it properly, the rhetorician must humanize *his* subject as a first duty. He must, as Dean Hunt urges, become more than a specialist in the techniques of rhetoric, its vocal problems, its audience analysis problems; he must become more than an expert in semantics and in the use of words; he must become as at home in the pages of Aristotle as he is in his speech text. The pedagogical problem for those of us responsible for speech in our schools is no longer 'How to teach speech' but 'Why teach speech.'

EDWIN BURR PETTET,
Carleton College

By emphasizing the contribution rhetoric has to make to the education of the whole man, Dean Hunt has rendered a service not only to teachers of rhetoric but also to teachers of communication in general education programs. I agree that as teachers in such programs seek to educate the individual for effective personal and social living, the concept of 'a good man skilled in speaking' cannot be omitted.

If, however, we are to carry this concept into practice, it seems to me we must focus our attention not on rhetoric *per se*, but on the individual, his needs and capabilities. With this focus we avoid the pitfall Dean Hunt mentions of teaching rhetoric merely as a field of specialized knowledge and substitute the teaching of the individual himself. In the speech or communication classroom the contribution that rhetoric has to make then falls into its proper place in his education. He learns that rhetoric is a means of communicating effectively. He learns that what he has become as a result of all his class (including speech class) and extra-class learning is an essential part of what and how he communicates. He learn that, to be 'a good man skilled in speaking' he must draw upon all the resources for in-

tegrated development that his general education has given him.

To help him develop himself he needs teachers both student-minded and familiar with the areas in his general education. These teachers are not easy to find. There are many college campuses though where they are being developed. Dean Hunt gives us good advice for developing ourselves into such teachers. He urges that we not only restudy Aristotle but that we supplement our study with psychology, the work of sociologists and semanticists, and other modern scientists. He urges too that we familiarize ourselves with the general education studies of our learner. It seems to me that following his advice we cannot help but become better teachers of men and of subject matter as well, because we will be forced to look upon the latter as important only as it is functional in the lives of those we teach.

RALPH C. LEYDEN,
Stephens College

REBUTTAL NOTES ON BRITISH AND AMERICAN DEBATING

In this issue we continue the discussion of British versus American Debating begun in the December 1949 issue. Since the reactions of debate coaches and tournament directors have already appeared we now turn to two new groups. The first is composed of former American intercollegiate debaters who have achieved distinction in their professions. The second group consists of debaters of the present day—students who opposed the Cambridge debaters during their tour of the United States in the spring of 1949.

GEORGE D. STODDARD *is president of the University of Illinois and chairman for the United States National Commission of UNESCO. As an undergraduate he debated at Pennsylvania State College,* VIRGIL M. HANCHER, *former Rhodes scholar, now president of the State University of Iowa, debated at Iowa and became a member of Delta Sigma Rho, national honorary forensics society.* CARTER DAVIDSON, *president of Union College, Schenectady, New York, is a former debater at Harvard.* ERWIN D. CANHAM, *the editor of* The Christian Science Monitor *and secretary of the United States National Commission of UNESCO, is a former champion debater at Bates College and a former Rhodes scholar.* WILLIAM T. FOSTER, *former president of Reed College and author of a well-known textbook on Argumentation and Debating, is a graduate of Harvard.* NORMAN TEMPLE *is a recent graduate of Bates College and was a member of the Bates team that spoke in the British Isles in the fall of 1946. He is now an instructor in Argumentation at Bates.*

The college affiliations of the American undergraduates appear following their names. We publish a large number of views because we believe they provide a valuable cross section of student opinion on the problems raised by the British debaters. We are inviting Messrs. Freeth and Cradock to make a finel reply in a later issue. EDITOR.

It strikes me that our Cambridge cousins, Freeth and Cradock, have something to say. To take their own word, the British debater (if a lawyer) is at home in 'the criminal court, with its strange mixture of fact and fiction cunningly compounded to sway the jury.' And, of course, the jury, or the audience, immensely enjoys the stunt. American debates do tend to become pitchers' duels rather than slugging matches, and there is, indeed, a wariness toward wit and an insistence upon facts.

I suggest that the two plans be wedded to see if we cannot produce offspring both lively and rational! Let the *witty* scientists, the minds both good and agile, appear in the scientific forums, while other scientists talk to each other. Certainly the British have no monopoly in wit, nor the Americans in logic. At the same time let us remember that some debaters need a lot of wit to cover up improvisation and logical error. The British, it seems to me, hate to get prepared on anything, while the Americans are frequently so well prepared that they can't shoot unexpectedly.

GEORGE D. STODDARD, *President*
University of Illinois

I was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford and am familiar with the differences between English and American debating.

In my opinion, each style would be better if it more closely approximated the other. The British unquestionably surpass us in ease, informality, persuasiveness, and humor. It has been my experience that British speakers generally get more closely in touch with their audiences in a shorter length of

time than do American debaters. American debaters could profit by an equally deft or skillful approach to their audiences.

On the other hand, British debates are often lacking in content. I recall particularly one debate in the Oxford Union on the question that 'This House Deplores the Present Trend of Population Toward the Cities.' Near the end, one of the speakers, a Canadian born in Missouri and therefore quite American in his point of view, produced some statistics which, to an American audience, would have demonstrated conclusively that there was no trend of population toward the cities. As I remember it, no later speaker on either side attempted to attack the validity of the figures or to confirm them. They were simply ignored. The debate proceeded on its way with the speakers deploring or refusing to deplore the trend of population toward the cities. I do not recall the outcome of the debate, but it was my impression that the figures produced by the Canadian had absolutely no effect on the outcome.

To me that was just as anomalous as the approach which concentrates on facts and figures and fails to use the arts of platform oratory to persuade where conviction may be difficult or impossible.

I think there is much truth in what Mr. Freeth and Mr. Cradock say, but there is additional truth which might be said which would alter their conclusions somewhat.

I repeat, that if English debating were to adopt some of the more substantial features of American debating and if American debating were to adopt some of the lighter elements of English debating, each would be better than it now is.

VIRGIL M. HANCHER, *President*
State University of Iowa

I find myself in general agreement with the criticisms leveled against American debaters by our visitors from Cambridge University. The first such international debate which I witnessed was in the fall of 1922, the opposing teams from Oxford and Harvard, the place, Symphony Hall, Boston. I was forced to stand, because every seat was taken. On that night the audience went away convinced that Harvard had won the logical argument, but Oxford had won the audience. The wit of the British debaters was greatly appreciated, but it often seemed beside the question. The Cambridge critics insist that the wit should grow out of the argument; I agree without cavil, but I have heard British debaters spend half their time satirizing the eating habits of their colleagues, or telling delightful anecdotes of their travels in America, all of which had nothing to do with the subject.

I agree that American debaters are too often stiff, formal, lacking in the conversational manner of presentation which makes for audience appeal. I agree that "canned rebuttals" are an unforgivable sin. I still remember with bitterness a debate in which I participated, where the opponents, in their rebuttals, brought out speeches typed on legal cap, and read them verbatim; when the critic judge gave them the decision and didn't even comment on the canned rebuttals, I began to lose confidence in critic judges.

I differ with our Cambridge friends, however, in the causes I find for these faults. The debate tournament, as commonly operated, does create an unreal, artificial situation. Four men and women standing in a small room, debating fiercely in the presence of an audience of one critic judge is truly ludicrous. Yet most of the attempts to escape from this situation have failed. If we shift

from the decision by judges to an audience decision, the home team has a natural advantage; this is true even if a vote on the question is taken before and after the debate. In this case the audience must vote on the merits of the question, not on the quality of the debating. I would like to suggest that intercollegiate debates be held before neutral audiences, perhaps of the student bodies of other colleges, and that any decision be given by audience vote on the merits of the debating, including oratorical audience appeal. One method I have found useful is to schedule these debates before luncheon clubs or other societies which have regular meetings and are always looking for appealing programs.

The second reason I discover for our lack of audience appeal is the essential dulness of the questions chosen for debate, and the sad fact that all the debates for an entire year must be on this same dull proposition. I would like to suggest that at least six propositions be 'approved' by the debating societies for each year, and that each team have only a day or two advance notice of the question it will debate. This would mean that all teams would step upon the platform with a fairly fresh approach, vocabulary, and mental attitude, and the audience could feel reasonably confident that the speeches would be extemporaneous rather than memorized.

Finally, I do not blame the coaches as strongly as the Cambridge teams do. Some coaches I have known did tend to stereotype their debaters and cases, but a good coach tries to let each student develop his own peculiar gifts. I personally used to spend hours trying to persuade students to relax, to have fun with the topic, to use satire and humor to the limit. But the American pressure is all toward winning the decision. Even debate coaches can be fired for failing to produce winning teams. Even the debaters in Parliament, the model for the British method, would fail of reelection if they couldn't win votes. Leaving the supervision of the debating to the students themselves would ordinarily result in chaos, as it would in dramatics or musical organizations. Students would feel they were getting nowhere, and would drop debating completely. I am interested in saving debate for the American college student, for I believe its educational value is highest among all student activities. But I cannot believe it will be saved by firing the faculty coach; rather the coaches must be persuaded that audience appeal is desirable and procurable, that propositions for debate can be interesting without being exhausting, and that they should not dominate but merely stimulate the students.

CARTER DAVIDSON, *President*
Union College

I am susprised that in 1949 British debaters are making exactly the same criticisms of American debating they made in 1921, when they first came here. I had thought that in the meantime a considerable leavening in American practices had taken place—and I still believe it has. Nevertheless, from the British comments, it is obvious that a considerable difference still prevails.

I am convinced there is a great deal of value in both systems of debating. The solid, factual preparation typical of American debating is important, but no more so than the wit and tactical brilliance of young men trained in the British school. I am sure we will not duplicate the 'House of Commons manner' in American colleges and universities because it depends upon a long tradition, and above all the special hothouse at-

mosphere of the British public school.

Americans must keep on pressing toward a more informal and illuminated style. If the 'canned rebuttal' still exists, this is appalling.

Your article shows what great values derive from international debating, and I believe that we have gained much more than the British by the cross-fertilization of styles.

ERWIN D. CANHAM, *Editor,*
The Christian Science Monitor,
Boston, Massachusetts

Our kind critics from Cambridge University have said much about debating in our country which we should ponder well. Certainly we should do more in our efforts 'to grip an audience and win its sympathy.' Certainly we should do much more to 'insert humor into the very web and woof of a speech.' In these respects, unhappily, our young debaters are no worse than most of their adults. Often our humor, if any, is crude and labored. I believe, however, that our debaters seldom, if ever, have 'too great a sense of logical argument and formal speech structure.' We do not say that an old and underfed horse has too firm and well-jointed a skeleton, even though we should like to have the skeleton beautifully covered. Our critics have the wrong impression if they believe that our debaters do not know how to present a case with a 'strange mixture of fact and fiction, cunningly compounded to sway the jury.' We *do* have debaters with that ability. We admit it—sadly.

WILLIAM T. FOSTER,
Jaffrey, New Hampshire

When Cambridge debaters Denzil Freeth and Percy Cradock begin their analysis of American debating with the statement, 'The American style . . . is completely different from ours,' they uttered a masterpiece of Churchillian understatement!

No American debater who has had the opportunity to tour Britain would dare deny the statement. They have no debate squads with just a few speakers in any one debate, but debates participated in by the entire houre; they do not debate one topic all season, but a different one every week; they do not have debate coaches or tournaments; they do not place emphasis upon presentation of a logical case backed up by evidence. Thus, when Edward Dunn and I returned in the fall of 1946 after representing Bates College in twelve international debates in England and Scotland, we first post-war American debaters might have said, 'The British style of debating is completely different from ours.' We did discuss these differences in the February 1948 issue of the QJS.

We would have to agree in large part with the conclusions reached by our two friends from Cambridge. Most British debates are, without question, more lively and enthusiastic than most American debates.

We would say that use of a single topic all year and lack of audience participation in a real measure account for this. The Cambridge debaters, however, attribute this American shortcoming to the influence of the debate coach and debate tournaments, and it is at this point that one can no longer agree so wholeheartedly with our British cousins.

The real answer, it seems to me, can best be found by briefly examining attitudes in the two countries.

The British are renowned as a country of statesmen and diplomats. Their history of government and international diplomacy is far older than our own. Their people are intensely interested in

national politics and in policies concerning the Empire. Their students are, generally, more informed about the political scene than are our own students. The British Civil Service has long enjoyed an exalted position in the mind of the British citizen, and British debaters almost to a man hope to crown successful debating careers with entry into Government service. (Even an Empire medical student we met at Leeds hoped to obtain his M.D., become well versed in Labour Party policies, and get back to his own country as soon as possible so that he might become a leader in a movement for Socialized Medicine there).

As they debate, most British students secretly hope some day to enter the pages of British history beside the names of Cromwell, Gladstone, Disraeli, Balfour, Baldwin, Churchill, or Atlee.

Americans, on the other hand, are not so politically conscious or desirous of political careers or Government service. The American thinks far less highly of his Civil Service and of his government in general than do the British of their own. Outstanding statesmen and diplomats are not glorified in the American mind like Disraeli or Gladstone in the British mind. American political lethargy is well demonstrated in a review of the percentages of eligible voters who turn up at the polls on election day!

Thus, American debates are not thronged to by politically enthusiastic students and do not become 'alive' with audience participation even when open forums or audience participation are advertised. American attempts to encourage audience participation in debates have often ended in failure because too few are interested or informed enough in political and economic questions to stand up on their own two feet to express their views. How often have we heard long embarrassing silences when American chairmen have opened the debate to questions or opinions from the audience. And when there has been audience participation, how often have the remarks or speeches come from debaters in the audience rather than from others not on the debate squad!

In addition to the difference in attitudes toward politics, there is a difference in purpose. British debaters train for politics; American debaters, for legal careers primarily, even though avowedly many covet eventual places in the American political sun.

Freeth and Cradock state that British debating is political and oratorical. Such training may well serve a useful purpose in later Parliamentary careers, but of what use is oratory in the law court? The American debater who seeks a successful career in the law must know how to organize arguments, how to recognize and refute specious or fallacious evidence or arguments, how to conduct research, how to write a brief. Thus, some of our best American debaters, by our own standards, not British standards, are not ones who are political and oratorical in manner, expert in winning an audience by reason of their platform manner, but students whose organization of material, clarity of reasoning, and forcefulness of facts clearly demonstrate the truthfulness of their case.

It is here that the American debate coach plays a large part. True, as the Cambridge men state, one can learn much in the way of oratory and audience appeal from reading and listening to speeches of great men like Roosevelt and Churchill. But, by such reading and listening, can one learn how to conduct research, how to reason clearly, how to organize facts into a logical argument which would stand up under the critical examination of a judge and jury?

Some points from British debating we might well take to heart. We should work for larger audiences even as the politicians seek a greater percentage of our voters going to the polls. If audience participation in debates could be encouraged and developed we would ultimately have livelier debates and debating would become more popular with students not on the regular squad. Platform debaters would have to be on their toes if every statement they made was open to immediate refutation from the floor! We might also get away from the practice of using a single topic. Tournaments in the same geographical location could be held more frequently and would be more fun to all participants if the stock arguments and answers on a given topic were not old stuff to everyone. More debates could be held on the home campus with greater appeal than when several are held all on the same topic. Debates between local students might become as popular as the first intercollegiate debate on a single topic for the year.

This would not mean that we would have to discard our coaches! In direct refutation of the British plea to set American debating free by cutting loose from the coach's apron-strings, it might be said that British debates could still be as lively as they are even with coached teams—and, British debates might then be more informative as well as entertaining!

To trade our American system of coaches, tournaments, statistics, evidence, case preparation and teamwork in presentation for the British exhibitionism in the use of words, oratory, humor, and political appeal, would not be the type of 'freedom' most American debaters would choose!

NORMAN TEMPLE,
Bates College

REPLIES FROM AMERICAN DEBATERS

It is important that basic differences between British and American debating be brought out clearly at the outset. The American debater is rarely surrounded by an audience; the American debater does not function as a political leader; the American debater is generally not a member of a definite group earmarked for a great political future. These are differences that exist. The goal of American debating is not to have the audience 'cheering, interrupting, etc.' the speaker, but to have individual members of the audience reach a conclusion on the topic being presented. It may be said that 'cheering, interrupting, etc.' does show conviction, but we would argue that this type of display is often vocal rather than mental.

We believe the average American debater feels debating can be fun, though he hasn't participated in a forensic contest with the 'mad English.' The British gentlemen are absolutely correct in saying humor should play an important part in a debate. A pretty dress can make the poorest and homeliest woman attractive. However, we take issue with the suggestion that American debaters have too great a sense of logical argument. This, we think, is impossible for any debater. The American debater may not be adept at flowering the logical argument, at relating germane stories and witticisms, he may not be flexible enough (all of these things depend upon the individual speaker), but he certainly has not suffered from too great a sense of logical argument. 'Canned rebuttals' do not logically follow from too great a sense of logical argument, and this form of mental stagnation is certainly not suggested by any debate coach who deserves the name.

The American debate tournament can be defended only feebly. Its meager advantage lies in the fact that the tournament offers a concentrated group of speaking opportunities. We readily admit, on the other hand, that four contestants with an equal number of blank walls, a sleepy-eyed and frequently bored judge, and an inanimate object known as a time-keeper present a very artificial situation at

best. The speaker trained in such situations will be at a loss when an audience situation finally does present itself.

As for debate coaches, we think a defense necessary and proper. Granted that there are coaches who tell debaters what to say and when to say it, it must also be remembered that there are many excellent men in the speech field who are truly trying to give valuable training to student speakers. There are coaches who guide rather than dictate. The coaches who dictate arguments and cases are responsible for the degenertaion of American debate. They advocate that students learn by rote the strategems and evidence supplied in debate handbooks, thus impeding, if not preventing, individual research and thinking.

We believe the most significant idea to be gained from the impressions of Mr. Freeth and Mr. Cradock is that the principle of debating the 'American way' has been perverted by lazy or misinformed coaches and students. In the main we agree with the British gentlemen that much is lacking as far as our debate programs are concerned. Our debating is lifeless. We do not consider the audience. Tournament debating is questionable. However, we do not agree that there is no need for competent 'coaches'; nor that good speakers are born and know public address by instinct; nor that a debater can have too great a sense of logical argument; nor that Demosthenes, Burke, Lincoln, Roosevelt, and Churchill can teach more in a week than a *competent* debate coach can teach in a year.

ALFRED MAKULEC,
GORDON MACK,
University of Illinois

Last April I had the unique experience of debating the Cambridge University team, represented by George Pattison and Denzil Freeth. Thus it was with great personal interest that I read their reaction to our American style of debating. Being the only woman debater these two gentlemen met, I feel I should certainly make use of my feminine privilege, viz., the woman always gets the last word!

First of all, I must admit I had a perfectly wonderful time during the British debate. I 'let my hair down' and ended up debating for the fun of it. I had to! After fifteen minutes of practically unadulterated froth from the British, what audience would tolerate a serious approach to a question that we were supposed to be debating? We are told that British debating *accentuates* audience appeal. But what appeals to the average audience? Not close, logical argumentation, but (to borrow some of the King's English), 'joyous, lively, bacchic stuff.'

Now I wouldn't think of denying that such debating is fun, but we Americans don't feel that the *purpose* of debate is to have fun and to gain audience approval. Such goals as these can be obtained in other forensic activities. We believe that the primary purpose of debate is to develop in the individual a clear sense of logic. In preparation the student gains invaluable practice in research, in organization of research material. He must learn to separate the extraneous from the pertinent and to present his side of the argument in a forceful manner. Then he must be alert to his opponent's argument—looking for irrelevant remarks, inaccurate facts, begging of the question, etc., and prepare to point out those errors to his own advantage.

In relation to this, let me mention another great difference between American and British debating. The British debater always argues for that which he personally believes. The American debater, on the other hand, must be equally prepared to uphold both the affirmative and negative of the question. Believing that we are naturally so prejudiced, so subjective, so inclined to look at only one side of a question, we Americans believe that debating offers invaluable training in objectivity and open-mindedness. It's easy to fight for something you believe, but it's a wonderful mental exercise (and also loads of fun) to fight just as hard for something you don't personally believe, and to win your argument simply by attacking flaws in your opponent's logic. It is because of this basic purpose of American debating, therefore, that our debating is *not* emotional and may appear cold. Realizing the fact that man is by nature emotional rather than logical, too many orators, politicians, leaders, and lawyers appeal to the *emotions* of their audience. But don't we need to get away from that today? Don't we need to look at things in a saner, more intelligent, and objective manner? Perhaps when we think about this business of audience appeal, branding American debating as 'unemotional' is a compliment rather than an insult.

I do want to commend our English friends on their oratorical and rhetorical technique. Their command of the English language was nothing short of magnificent, and I agree that we American debaters could undoubtedly profit from a more flexible command of the

mother tongue. However, I could scarcely refrain from chuckling when I read that Americans rarely inserted humor except by extraneous funny stories which often impeded the flow of the argument. Let me reply that the argument of our English friends seemed extraneous to the flow of their funny stories! With the Britishers the *logic* instead of the *audience* seemed to become 'superfluous, ignored, unwanted, and departed, alas, unmourned.'

In closing I want to say that although we Americans wouldn't want a steady diet of British debating, interspersing our American style with the English is a sheer delight, and we will welcome the Britishers at any time with keen anticipation.

ELIZARETH B. FLORY,
Stetson University

As an American debater who fits the Cambridge cross section well enough to have used facts in debating Percy Cradock and Duncan Macrae last spring. I feel compelled to take exception to the contemporary attitude of my English friends regarding the quality and purpose of American debate. If one would grant that the purpose of debate was solely political and oratorical, designed to excite audiences emotionally; . . . if we would grant that the desired end of college debate is training more filbustering Congressmen and verbose members of Commons where the 'careless rapture and heady joys of oratory' now reign supreme, it would be easier to agree with the British impression. One might well argue, however, that the main weaknesses of democratic governments stem from the effects of careless oratory. That the purpose of college debate should be to train more of the same type of orators seems to me to be sheer folly. While a rational analysis of the problem is fundamental to any good debate, British or American, it is hard for the best of debaters to present a sound analysis that does not have foundation in fact. The attempt of some debaters of the past generation to defend any position without reason or purpose other than a display of oratorical skill was a major factor in the decline of college debate in this country. That American debate is now rejecting sophistry indicates by no means a trend toward decay. On the contrary debate is only now climbing out of the pit the so-called 'Golden Era' dug. The proper use of fact and statistics does not hurt the quality of debate in any way, but tends to raise its intellectual level to reality. Audiences too find new interest in speakers with more to do than indulge in the 'careless raptures' of oratory. There is considerable room for improvement in American debating. Tournaments are far from the ideal situation, but they give many undergraduate debaters opportunities for speaking and sources of professional criticism which would be unobtainable elsewhere. If great orators were born and not made, neither system should do too much damage to truly great oratory. Far better than attempt the development of a few oratorical giants, college debate can teach students to be objective, reason rationally and accurately, and to become more mature thinkers. Today the need for rational thinkers is far greater than for political orators.

ROGER COZENS,
University of Colorado

I was keenly interested in the appraisal of American debating of Messrs. Freeth and Cradock. I envy their vantage point, for their numerous contacts with American teams all over the country enable them to categorize American teams perhaps with greater accuracy than many Americans. My comments will stem specifically from two personal encounters with Oxford teams at Yale, and generally from personal observations on the American technique and rationale.

To begin with, I confess with alacrity the multifarious deficiencies that arise in America as a result of sparse and disinterested audiences. Too often the American debater (certainly in the East) finds himself speaking to his opponents, the debate coach, the judges, and his roommate. The passive impact of an alert and sensitive audience is missing; originality is, in a measure, stultified, and the address tends to dryness, to the marrow of straightforward exposition, lacking at times grace and symmetry.

But violent umbrage do I take, sir (!), at the generalization that the American technique is unfruitful. The art of debate is not, for me at least, the art of oratory. It is an aesthetic experience to listen to Churchill as it must have been to listen to Demosthenes. Great phrases, greatness of thought and expression, ruddy and moving eloquence are noble accomplishments to which all men in public life aspire. But give Sparticus' address to the Gladiators or Burke's plea for conciliation with the American colonies, or Lincoln's Gettysburg Address to a young actor, and a highly creditable rendition will be given. This is oratory but it is not debate; and the American has sought to dissociate the two. If the English observers had confined their criticisms to American oratory I should have agreed

with them, I should have honored their criteria as my own. But the Cambridge men were on a debate junket, and heard for the most part, I assume, American debating, not American oratory.

For the American, debate is precisely a battle of logic, neatly packaged and lethally levelled. For us the straightforward approach is the fundamental and intellectual approach, transcending in value the excessive frills, which, in the last analysis, are lamentably superficial embellishments to what should constitute a battle of minds. Victory in such a battle should be resolved in favor of the more skillful plea on behalf of one interpretation, not in favor of the more entertaining presentation.

We submit that this is the intellectual approach to *debate*—which must not be confused with its cousin, oratory. Such an approach pays deference to the maturity of the listener. Towards this end American debating is oriented. The program is self-conscious. It is perhaps unromantic, but no more so than the facts and cases and briefs which make up our world and constitute the springboard from which public policy is formulated.

WILLIAM F. BUCKLEY, JR.
Yale University

During the spring of 1949 when the Cambridge debating teams were touring the United States I had the pleasure of debating Mr. Percy Cradock and Mr. Duncan Macrae before an audience of some size.

British debating seems to direct itself toward the natural development of argumentive speakers, particularly in the extemporaneous field, and toward the presentation of a medium of genuine entertainment. On the other hand, the function of American debating is to provide a forum upon which to argue important issues of the day in a sincere and serious vein. It is thought that with this approach speakers can be developed who are concerned wholly with the preparation and presentation of valid arguments. Thus American debating is directed toward the judge with cold heart and calculating mind while British debating is pointed toward the audience with warm heart and often no mind.

My complaint is simply that British debating purchases its entertainment and fun value at the price of mental prostitution. The British debater doesn't care whether his argument is correct and corresponds to the facts or whether it exemplifies the most blatant kind of logical fallacy and misinterpretation of fact. He is after the emotional appeal.

Our two critics have attempted to avoid this charge by saying that words should live and be used with their full *emotive* associations. This, they tell us, is necessary, because words that are used 'merely' as symbols help one avoid deeper *rational* analysis. Notice—rational analysis through emotive words. That is not only out of mood with the rest of their article. It is logically absurd. The use of emotive and living words is the best way to skirt rational analysis and appeal to the passions of the audience. I think the general sense of most of their argument concedes this.

I have no doubt that the British system will develop the greater orators and we would do well to copy many of its elements. The present American system actually suppresses natural ability. I don't think the tournaments and coaches are causes of this. I rather think that they also are creatures of an educational system which, in its emphasis on artificial criteria and cultural conformity, has eliminated the atmosphere of free and daring self-expression. But most of the Cambridge debaters' observations are valid. There is no denying them.

However, let the British remember this. If they train a youth to shape his entire speech activity toward an audience appeal, they too, are training an automaton. If that individual's thinking is influenced by his training in speech (which is very likely) he will not become a sincere thinker, a sincere leader, or even a sincere follower. He will be useful as a tool for political parties and social institutions but as a genuine self-directed force for good in society he will be of very doubtful worth.

This observation certainly doesn't apply to Mr. Cradock and Mr. Macrae. But an unbalanced emphasis on the British approach can bear fruit in the long run, that may not be at all apparent at the present time.

HOWARD E. GOLDFARB,
Washington & Jefferson College

To assume that American debating is poor debating because it emphasizes facts, sound arguments, and an appeal to reason rather than generalities, jokes, and an appeal to the emotions is to condemn blindly.

In debating the Oxford Union Society team last year, I found that although the audience was entertained by the British oratory, it was not convinced by the sweeping generalities which accompanied it.

Good American debaters speaking before an audience are capable of working humor into their arguments, without jettisoning fact and

logic altogether. If an improvement in American debating is to be made, it will not be done by adopting the method of our British cousins. It will come only by placing reason before emotion, but not to its exclusion.

In some quarters American debate is devoid of any human touch, and where such a situation exists, the fault lies with the speaking situation which surrounds a typical American debate. A debater who has for his audience one or three judges and no one else is bound to lose that audience sense which can only be built upon mutual stimulation. In such circumstances a debater quickly becomes a something-short-of-human speaking machine. Perhaps it is the few who have fallen into this rut that gave the Cambridge team its impression.

While an audienceless situation is typical of many American debates, it is by no means universal, and because most American debaters speak to audiences a good deal of the time, the art of appealing to fellow humans is not lost.

As a matter of fact, American debating is as good for Americans as British debating is for Englishmen. Perhaps it was an attempt to equate England and America which led the debaters from Cambridge to miss the essence of American debate.

America is not England; our audiences are very seldom an interrupting, vocal part of the speaking situation; our debaters are seldom interested in becoming great political orators. America is a place where audiences listen quietly and ask respectful questions later, a place where business executives and company lawyers are looked up to, and above all, a place where the emphasis on fact and logic which is taught by American debate coaches pays off in the board meeting, the committee meeting, and civil law court.

If, as the Cambridge men say, the British debater prepares himself for the criminal court with its strange combination of fact and fiction, then the American debater prepares himself for the business conference with its stranger combination of law and statistics.

CHARLES E. LILIEN,
The George Washington University

The American style of debating *is* decidedly different from the British style. Here, at least we may both agree. No American debater who has faced, no spectator who has observed a performance by the 'mad British,' has any doubt that the Union Societies accentuate audience appeal. In comparison, the American debater appears as a candidate for a position of 'junior business executive.' Trained in the methods of research and problem-solving analysis, he is prepared to offer rational arguments for a carefully weighed course of action. To be sure, the American debater urges the adoption of his particular course of action, but he also respects the considered judgment of his board of directors, whose privilege and desire is to adopt the best of all alternatives. In this sense, the British debater is not so confident of the audience. He approaches it more like a politician 'whose most sympathetic atmosphere is that of the criminal court, with its strange mixture of fact and fiction cunningly compounded to sway the jury.' With such a contrast, one frequently hears this typical comment about an Anglo-American clash: 'well, judging by British methods, they were superior; by American methods, we were superior.' Consequently, wisdom would suggest that we may well learn from each other.

If the debaters we have met are typical products of British debating, we would offer the following considerations:

1. You are distinguished for your excellent rhetoric and superb diction. Continue to orate for the amusement and to the amazement of your audiences.

2. The use of *argumentum ad hominem* against your opponent rather than against his argument may appear as spontaneous wit to the British audience. The American audience resents it as impolite, though clever, sarcasm. Control your humor.

3. The success of the democratic process depends in a large measure upon an enlightened and rational citizenry. Respect its capacity to judge the issue fairly when all the facts are presented. Raise the level of debate above a cunningly compounded mixture of fact and fiction. Give more facts! Let the people think!

For American debaters we would offer the following considerations:

1. Accept the sincerity of the British recommendations and turn the spirit of their suggestions to future advantage.

2. To do this we should not abolish the two institutions blamed for American 'defects'—the debate tournament and the debate coach. Indeed, that would be retrogression, for the debate tournament and coach have made an outstanding contribution to democracy. The British would have us return to the good old days of bacchic, heady oratory served to intoxicate the audience. Those were the days when a small, select artistocracy of debaters prepared all year for one or two popular public appearances. Today, the naturally gifted still rise to the top

as leaders in debates and in civic affairs. But with what a difference! All students have an opportunity for the training necessary to achieve their individual peak of development in research, problem-solving analysis and platform delivery. The average debater could discredit many of the giants who swayed the emotions of the audiences of yesterday. The debate tournament and coach have helped make possible a more enlightened and articulate participation in and leadership of today's electorate. The good ol' days were not so good!

3. Yet today is not so good that tomorrow need not be made better. Too often our debating has victory in a tournament as its goal. Continuous speaking to four blank walls and a judge is not adequate training for public speaking. The tournament should be used as a *means* of testing logic and preparation. The real test of delivery should be to an actual audience presentation.

To establish intimate and sympathetic contact with the audience, to utilize the naturally humorous situation, to present what has been prepared rationally and tested formally in a tournament—to do all this with the flexibility of a showman requires repeated experiences with audiences. Thus we need to increase the outreach of the school and college debate work to their respective civic communities. The increased use of speakers bureaus and program services could play a major role here for the convenience of the community and for the enrichment of the speaker. The use of varied styles of debates, such as cross-examination and audience-participation, would add interest. Our excellent training needs to be directed toward its use before 'live' audiences.

With more experience before audiences, American teams will be eminently prepared to accept the British invitation to prove that American standards are *fundamentally* superior.

HARRY B. STULTS,
College of Wooster

If the Cambridge debaters whose article appeared in the December QJS have met the representative cross section of American teams which they claim to have, then I think that our coaches can truly say, 'mission accomplished.' Here in the East where remnants of literary society debating still flourish we have yet to develop debaters skilled in the use of logic and fact and imbued with those concepts of ethics and social purposefulness which have been the particular contribution of good coaching.

It is true that in some instances the American's preoccupation with logical argument on a factual basis have led him to forget principles of audience adaptation. The alternative represented by our British friends is equally forgetful.

Our belief is that in a free, competitive market for ideas those will survive which are most ably supported by truth. Our laws protect the buyer against short weight in purchasing; our debate ethics should protect the audience against short weighting in facts. It is true that some advertising and window-dressing may be necessary if we are to attract and hold customers and audiences, but we must not scarifice the content for the form.

I wonder if the British style of debate is as persuasive in its long range effect on the audience as the American can be. The British process of 'muddling through' a series of haphazard and apparently unrelated arguments includes a lot of waste motion. In my opinion it must yield to the sleek lines of the well organized and articulated American type of debate. An audience which is confused is not likely to be convinced even though it may have been charmed.

Messrs. Freeth and Craddock have presented a useful criticism of our debate set-up. However, I do not see how we can yield to them on the issues of basic values and purposes in debate.

IRWIN KUHR,
Temple University

I have no intention of 'roundly refuting' the criticisms of American debating made by our British friends. Although Bates has enjoyed a fair degree of success in winning debate tournaments, our Council is less than enthralled by such super-competitive speech making. Personally, I regard the debate tournament as a boring marathon. In its defense, however, it may be said to gratify a basic American desire for competition.

As to the quality of American debating, per se, I would like to take exception to the British observations. Bates had the pleasure, last spring, of entertaining Mr. Freeth and Mr. Pattison. Mr. Freeth and I upheld a motion involving the 'saneness' of a preventive war. Mr. Pattison and William Stringfellow of Bates opposed. The debate was 'English style' before a large and attentive audience. Now in the light of the criticisms of which Mr. Freeth is co-author, it is interesting to recall that, although he proved to be an excellent debater by any standard, he *did*, use an irrelevant joke! We all did. Despite the criticism of 'canned' humor—some of the humor

of both our English friends was obviously preconceived. Some of ours was, too. Despite the fact that Mr. Freeth dislikes tournaments, his reply for the affirmative (much to my satisfaction) ripped apart the negative contentions in the best tournament style. Mr. Pattison was much more philosophical in his approach.

Generally speaking, British debaters deal much more in personalities and much less in issues than we Americans. This is often good fun, but I believe that an issue, however dull, is of more importance than a debater's personality, however quaint. To be as frank as our British friends, with a hope for a bit more objectivity, I believe we can learn a great deal from each other. This may be the best reason for International Debating. We Americans can learn how to enjoy debating to a greater extent, and they perhaps could use a dash of our statistical accuracy; moreover I am convinced that a really good debate coach would insist that debating be for both pleasure and information.

CHARLES RADCLIFFE,
Bates College

The criticism that has been made of American debating techniques by two former British visitors, I think in the large measure is justified. However, to condemn tournaments and American debating technique entirely, I feel is unwarranted.

It is true that the American style tends to be stilted, factual, and when carried to an extreme, uninteresting and monotonous. But this style has its values. It places emphasis on the logical argument; perhaps the core of American system is that we consider ourselves as speaking to a rational, reasoning audience, and hence with this basic assumption our style naturally becomes logical, reasoned, and factual. It might be said fairly, I think, that the American speaker attempts to deal with his audience as a reasoning group, while our English friends seem to consider them first as emotional beings and only secondly as reasoning people.

Even in view of the above, which I consider to be the fundamental difference, I am happy to agree with much of the criticism offered by our British friends. Too often is American debating technique carried to an extreme. Speeches do become mere recitals of facts and figures. But what is the reason for this? I hasten to suggest that it is the judging system used in most American debates wherein the judges does not look at the presentation of an argument as a whole, but rather at the individual parts, if a particular number of arguments are made by a given speaker he is awarded a given number of points by the judge.

The audience appeal of a speaker, his delivery is rarely given great weight. As a result the American debater has increasingly designed his speech not for an audience, but rather for a judge.

I think it fair at this time, to point out what we as American debaters consider the greatest mistakes our English friends make.

First, since the usual procedure is 10-10-5-5 arrangements for speeches, we find it most annoying for our British friends to 'soften' the audience in each of their speeches for ten minutes and then an additional ten minutes to debate. Under our view, the problem is not only one of convincing people of a particular point of view, but convincing them in ten minutes. We therefore feel that twenty minutes for a main speech and seventeen minutes for a rebuttal by our English friends is not exactly cricket.

Too often I have heard the remark after an English debate (which our opponents always seem to win), 'When you think about it, the English fellows really didn't have much of an argument, did they?' My point here is that the English style convinces for the moment, but leaves a person with no lasting impression as to the value of the argument.

I have the impression, and it is only an impression, that our English opponents approach debating not from the point of view of argument, or discussion, but to entertain an audience for a short period. Again I point out that while they never fail to be entertaining, the arguments they forward are rarerly ones which either their opponents or their audience seem to be able to remember for any length of time.

There is no doubt that we have much to learn from our English friends: their method of handling their audience is something worthy of study by American debaters. On the other hand, our English friends might greatly benefit from a study of American style so that they might have an argument convincing not only for the moment, but for a reasonable time after they have left the podium.

FREDERICK M. PEYSER, JR.,
Williams College

My reaction to the article in the December QJS has been neither violent nor passive. The Britishers' comments contain grains of truth and fiction. As an American debater who has met and heard several British teams, I think I can appreciate both points of view.

In the first place I believe that the British style of debating is completely different from ours. Whereas Americans emphasize ideas or content at times almost to the exclusion of other factors, the British concern themselves with audience adaptation, seemingly forgetting that at sometime within the speaking situation they should develop arguments relative to the question at hand. Most British speeches are elusive and hard to follow as a result of this all-out effort to adapt. How often have we heard British speakers spend at least three-quarters of their time discussing the beauty of an Iowa hog or what a harrowing experience it is to reach Moscow, Idaho by rail! Adaptation is an essential element in speaking, but our British friends should remember that 'debate' per se implies not only entertainment, but also persuasion.

Yet, some of the British condemnations are all too true. Certainly the most glaring weakness of American debating is, in turn, our failure to adapt to an audience situation. This is a direct result of our emphasis upon tournament speaking and its accompanying evils of time cards and the ever-present judge. Is it any wonder that speaking becomes unnatural and stilted? The debater works one question to death for an entire academic year, hashing and re-hashing the same ideas until the staleness of the situation is almost suffocating. Often his only concern is to win, and heaven help the judge who cannot follow his machine-gun clatter. How often is the average American debater called upon to meet a really challenging audience situation? *Almost never!* Debating has come to be thought of only as a grindstone upon which to sharpen our logical processes.

Whereas our debaters are able to handle argument with reasonable facility, it is true that they too often lack flexibility and have no real feeling for words. In part this condition is the fault of the debate tournament and of the debate coach. Yet, if our British critics had gone a step further, they probably would have discovered that they were condemning our entire educational philosophy.

In our attempt to retreat from the classical excesses of the last century, we have stressed the cold statistical approach not only to debating but also to many other areas of our educational system. This does not mean that all is bad in the newer viewpoint or that all was good in the older. Rather we should realize that both philosophies offer much and that we should synthesize the best from each. We cannot omit emphasis on great literature and history any more than we can throw overboard the contributions of the semanticist and the phonetician. Effective debating depends upon our ability to utilize all the elements in the field of learning.

My answer is: 'Yes, we can make improvements in American debating.' But we will not reduce our level of efficiency, and our giants will be even greater.

C. David Cornell,
State University of Iowa

TWO YEARS TOWARDS A NATIONAL THEATRE

C. Lawton Campbell

IN the February 1948 issue of the QJS, I had the privilege of illustrating a plan for a decentralized national theatre. This plan was the platform for the proposed operations of the reactivated American National Theatre and Academy (ANTA), an organization chartered in 1935 by the Congress of the United States to stimulate theatrical production in every state of the Union. The plan was broad and bold in its concept and filled with hope for and pride in the future of the American theatre. Although two years are a small fraction in the centuries-old annals of the drama and only a stepping stone in the long climb to a real renaissance of the theatre in this country, these two years just passed are worthy of an accounting.

It is obvious that no magic wand has been waved. No great foundation has been set up for the theatre by a Rockefeller or a Carnegie.

First, an organization on a country-wide and state-wide basis. ANTA has expanded its Board of Directors to include in different sections of the country a number of key figures identified with various phases of both the professional and non-professional theatre. ANTA has increased its corporate and group membership so that there is today at least one corporate member in every state of the Union and group members in almost every state, as well as in Hawaii, Alaska, and Japan. These corporate and group members are ANTA's liaison with all theatrical activity in their individual states and communities. They are also the channels through which the need and desire for good theatre in each state or community are screened and presented to the national headquarters for advice and action.

Next on the agenda of accomplishment in the past two years is the development of ANTA as a bureau of service. That the theatre needed a central clearing-house has long been apparent, but until ANTA got into operation no one could have conceived of how great this need actually was. The demand for advice, guidance, and channeling the needs of individuals and of both professional and non-professional groups in every part of the country has assumed very sizable proportions and has taxed ANTA's staff and volunteers to the limit. To list all the requests for service that ANTA receives would be impossible, but a few examples will help to illustrate not only the variety of needs, but also the form of service ANTA gives to meet them.

A call comes from Aaronsburgh, Pennsylvania, for Corporate Member Cornel Wilde to narrate a pageant commemorating the 150th Anniversary of the Salem Lutheran Church of Aaronsburgh. The American Educational Theatre Association invites ANTA's Vice-President, Helen Hayes, to address their convention in Salt Lake City by long-distance telephone. ANTA is asked to arrange for Board Member Blanche Yurka to give her 'One Woman Show' at a reception honoring Professors E. C. Mabie, A. M. Drummond and John Dolman at an American Educational Theatre Association Convention. A re-

COLONEL C. LAWTON CAMPBELL *is Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American National Theatre and Academy. He is a graduate of Princeton University and has long been a devoted patron of the drama.*

quest comes from N. Bryllion Fagin of Johns Hopkins for Dorothy Sands to present her 'American Theatre Highlights' for the Annual Amos Taylor, Jr. Memorial Lecture. The Kansas City Resident Theatre asks for help in getting Donald Buka to appear in 'Golden Boy,' or from Augustana College in Sioux Falls comes the request for ANTA to welcome Keith Herrington, from the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre in England, who will arrive in New York enroute to Augustana to play the lead in 'Taming of the Shrew.' A call from here asks advice about the newest kind of switchboard. Another call from over there wants help in a serious problem of acoustics. Still others want expert advice on how to convert a bowling alley, an ice-house, or a Quonset hut into a theatre. There is a never ending stream of these calls, and ANTA gives equal consideration to all of them, no matter how minute they may seem in the general over-all theatre picture.

ANTA's bureau of service is manned by a small paid staff, by volunteer workers, and by committees of voluntary professional experts. The services cover every phase of the theatre and fall into six general categories: recommendation and supply of personnel; advice on technical problems; guidance on plans for promotion, budgets and business; demands for new scripts; procurement of speakers and conference material; and, finally, provision or criticism of blueprints for creating and building theatres from the ground up.

On the personnel side, ANTA has supplied name players, resident playwrights, administrative assistants, stage managers, every type of technical expert, business managers, and any type of personnel connected with and needed for better theatre where the demand arises. On the technical side, Jo Mielziner and his committee of technical specialists have studied and advised on every phase of production from lighting to building theatres. ANTA's committee on business and promotion have advised on publicity, raising funds, increasing audiences, practical budgets, and any aspect of this subject for which requests are made.

ANTA's Script Department has been a boon to playwrights as well as to groups all over the country seeking new plays, rights to old ones, and all kinds of information on scripts. The Script Department has received 947 plays in the last two years and has sent an average of eight plays apiece to 318 theatres in 42 states, Alaska, Hawaii, and Japan, resulting in 72 productions of plays that otherwise might never have been done. Thirty-nine playwrights have had a chance to see their new scripts performed by competent companies during this period. ANTA's Speakers' Bureau has filled over 200 dates, sending out the biggest names in the theatre for personal appearances at every kind of theatre function. And finally, it can safely be said that if any one individual or group conceives the idea of setting up a resident theatre, the chances are ninety-nine out of a hundred the call for advice and assistance will come to ANTA. At present there are plans for thirty resident companies pending and under consideration with ANTA's help and under the technical scrutiny of ANTA's experts. These facts should convince even the most skeptical that ANTA's bureau of service is being rewarded with results.

Third on the agenda of two years of accomplishment is ANTA's role in the national governmental scene and on the international level. When UNESCO was organized, the American theatre was in no way represented on the United States' side. Last year ANTA was given a seat

on the National Commission for UNESCO and, in being given this seat, became the official representative of the theatre in the United States on the National Commission. In addition, two years ago when the International Theatre Institute was formed under the sponsorship of UNESCO, ANTA was invited by the State Department to become the United States Center for the International Theatre Insitute. In fact, the State Department has relied more and more on ANTA to speak and act in all national and international matters concerning the theatre. ANTA has prepared for the State Department exhibits on the American theatre which have been distributed by the Embassies of the United States in France, Brazil, South Africa, and Argentina, and by the U. S. Army in occupied countries. But the crowning recognition of ANTA on the governmental plane came last September when fifty United States Senators signed a letter to ANTA requesting ANTA to take over and operate the Belasco Theatre in Washington, D. C.

I wish I could say that the fourth accomplishment of ANTA has been on the large national scale commensurate with the coming to life of the other plans during the past two years. At any rate a dent has been made in that direction, namely the establishment of a National Foundation. It had been our hope in February 1948 that by this time a sizable part of that Foundation would have been laid, a Foundation of many millions of dollars to be raised through a national drive for funds, or large contributions, or government subsidy or through a combination of these. During the past two years, with no national drive, no large contributions and no government subsidy, ANTA has raised three quarters of a million dollars. This money came from memberships, some limited contributions, benefits, and various types of promotional efforts.

Out of this what-might-be-called 'preliminary foundation,' ANTA has financed its office operations, bureau of service, publications, paid the United States portion of the International Theatre Institute expenses, sent delegates to international theatre conferences and met many other expenses. But in addition, ANTA has lived up to the Foundation principle by making grants or loans in the amount of one-hundred and fifty thousands of dollars to worthy theatre projects. Organizations that received financial assistance from ANTA during the last two years include the Experimental Theatre, the State Theatre of Virginia (Barter Theatre), Equity Library Theatre, two talent showcases, Talent '48 and '49, and other projects worthy of ANTA's support. At least this is a beginning not too auspicious, but it does indicate that as the National Foundation builds and assumes sizable proportions, some day ANTA in addition to service and advice will be able to help resuscitate the theatre financially as the Arts Council has done in England.

Fifth in the listing of accomplishments should be research and compilations. ANTA's staff and volunteers have produced many surveys of theatre practices and conditions, compiled methods for ticket sales and promotion, assembled play and contest listings, and much other valuable theatre information. In association with AETA, ANTA has compiled the first Children's Theatre Directory and under ANTA's sponsorship there was published the most complete and useful 'Blueprint for Summer Theatre.' In fact, ANTA in this phase of its activity has become a center for the filtering, evaluation, and dissemination of theatre information, and a library of invaluable theatre records.

There are many other accomplishments that ANTA has made in the past two years, but a brief summary of a few of them should suffice here. Two years ago, the ANTA Album was instituted, the greatest single night's entertainment in our current theatre. In this one evening's performance, each year many of the great stars of the theatre appear in a scene from the play that made them famous. Started as a benefit for ANTA, the Album has become the high spot of every theatrical year and a vibrant page in the history of the American theatre. Last year ANTA presented a radio program called 'Theatre U.S.A.' over a national network and carried the ANTA story to every state in the Union. This year ANTA makes its debut in the record business. ANTA is building a library in record form of the important stars in their outstanding plays. The first 'ANTA Album of Stars' on records includes Helen Hayes in 'Victoria Regina,' John Gielgud in 'Richard II,' Eva LeGallienne in 'Hedda Gabler,' Frederic March and Florence Eldridge in 'Years Ago' and 'Skin Of Our Teeth.' The second album to follow this first one will include Katherine Cornell and Tallulah Bankhead. Other individual achievements include the Experimental Theatre, the showcases for new talent previously mentioned, and many other projects on a limited and local scale. Those listed here should illustrate the intense activity and encouraging results to date. Friends of ANTA can always get more detailed information about individual projects from ANTA's newsletter, a monthly bulletin included in ANTA's various types of memberships.

Two years ago the American National Theatre and Academy was a high-sounding name. It had a Congressional Charter and twelve years of relative inactivity behind it. Today the picture is different. The record is clear, perhaps not yet as far-reaching as it should be, but nevertheless clear in having made definite progress. ANTA is recognized by the United States Government, by European countries, by the professional theatre and by thousands of theatre leaders and individuals located in every state as an organization dedicated to increasing the stature and scope of a decentralized theatre, an organization which unselfishly and without profit will do everything within its power and present limitations to reach the goal of a national theatre worthy of the name and of our great country.

A national theatre in the United States and certainly a decentralized national theatre as ANTA conceives it consists of the sum total of all good theatre. Such a theatre is composed of many parts, many kinds of theatre, and the vitality of the whole depends on the health and growth of each part. No matter how small the project or how remote the problem, ANTA stands ready at all times to help. In this spirit and with increasing cooperation and experience, I feel safe in saying that the past two years, if they have taught us nothing else, have proved that ANTA has already justified its Charter and that a truly national theatre on the American plan can be achieved in these United States.

HOW GLOOMY IS IBSEN?

Alan Reynolds Thompson

'Dramas of Darkness.' This was the characteristic title of a magazine article of 1894 devoted chiefly to an attack on Ibsen. 'The true Ibsenite will tell you,' the author wrote, 'that life is full of gloom, of sadness, of wickedness . . .' The proper business of the stage, however, is to cheer us up. 'Give us,' he demanded, 'pictures of beauty, not of bitterness and gloom.'[1] Another critic, writing of 'Ghosts,' observed that 'the dullness and gloominess of the piece are unrelieved by any humor, imagination, or genuine power.'[2] And John J. Chapman, no contemptible critic (like the one just quoted), summed up the widespread feeling when he wrote: 'Shaw . . . can laugh, and is, to my mind, a thousand times a better man and a better artist than Ibsen, who can only scowl.'[3]

This view of Ibsen is of practical importance to directors of educational theatres. That it is in the minds of a great part of their audiences, whenever they assemble to see an Ibsen play, is a fact to be seriously reckoned with. And it is very likely to color if not distort the interpretations of the players and the director himself. Ibsen, if played for the gloom expected of him, will naturally not irradiate light, even when there is light to be shed.

In my opinion Ibsen is not as gloomy as he is thought to be. I lack time for a full-scale demonstration, but part of my evidence was published last summer in a book on irony in drama, a chapter in which was devoted to Ibsen.[4] In the course of time I hope to publish a book on Ibsen for the modern stage. Meanwhile, a few items of evidence.

First, a word about translations. The Archer edition is seldom literally inaccurate, but it is often emotionally inaccurate in conveying a stuffy mid-Victorian impression foreign to the Norwegian text. And it omits a great many of Ibsen's frequent italics,—a considerable loss for actors. I offer a few examples from 'The Master Builder.'

1. Hilda tells Solness how he kissed her, ten years before. Archer: 'You took me in both your arms, and bent my head back and kissed me—many times.' Ibsen wrote: 'and bent me back.'[5]

2. Hilda asks, 'Are all these drawings yours?' Solness, according to Archer, answers: 'No, they are drawn by a young man whom I employ to help me.' Literally, he says: 'No, that's a young man I have in to help me.'[6]

3. According to Archer, Solness cries, 'Ragnar—you must not ask me to do what is beyond my power.' Ibsen wrote, 'what I *can't* do!'[7]

4. Solness as rendered by Archer: 'Don't you agree with me, Hilda, that there exist special, chosen people who have been endowed with the power and faculty of desiring a thing, craving for a thing, willing a thing—so persistently and so—so inexorably—that at last it

ALAN REYNOLDS THOMPSON *is Professor of Speech and Dramatic Literature at the University of California.* *This article is based upon his paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Theatre Association in Washington in December 1948.*

[1] Austin Brereton, *The Illustrated American*, Mar. 3.

[2] Quoted by Annette Andersen, *Ibsen in America (Scandinavian Studies and Notes* 25, no. 5: Febr. 1937).

[3] Quoted by Andersen, no. 6: May, 1937.

[4] *The Dry Mock* (Berkeley, Calif., 1948).

[5] 'og bøjed mig bagover.'

[6] 'Nej, det er en ung mand, jeg har til at hjaelpe mig.'

[7] 'som jeg ikke *kan!*'

has to happen?' There are no italics in this translation, but Ibsen put stress on four words, the four rendered by 'desiring,' 'craving,' 'willing,' and 'has.' Literally, Solness says: 'there exist special, chosen people who have got need and might and power to *want* something, desire something, will something . . . so that they *must* get it at last.'[8]

The difference in effect between the direct, simple Norwegian, closely akin to colloquial English as it is, and Archer's genteel style, when sustained throughout an entire performance, is clearly considerable. In the former the characters talk like human beings. However gloomy their fortunes, they are at least alive.

And even their fortunes are by no means always gloomy. Ibsen could, and did, write comedies. Previous to 'Pillars of Society' he had written thirteen plays, yet few Americans know any of them except 'Peer Gynt.' It is otherwise with the dramatist's countrymen. We have statistics showing the number of performances of each of Ibsen's plays produced by the Norwegian National Theatre at Christiania (Oslo), during the second half of the nineteenth century.[9] If you were to guess which play was done oftenest, which play would you choose? You would be wrong. 'A Doll's House' ran fourth; 'Peer Gynt,' third. 'The Vikings at Helgeland' came second, and first was the comedy, 'The League of Youth.'[10] This play is a slashing satire on small-town politics. Its plot, which owes much to Scribe, at times borders on farce. Its characters are racy with idiosyncracies that call for illustrations by Cruikshank. Indeed, for a good English parallel we can best turn to *The Pickwick Papers,* in one chapter of which are described the political goings-on in the town of Eatanswill, where everybody belonged to the party of the Blues or the party of the Buffs, and agitated a parliamentary contest between the Honourable Samuel Slumkey and Horatio Fizkin, Esq. Ibsen's central figure, Stensgaard, an opportunist lawyer with the gift of gab, is a sharper and funnier caricature than either of these gentlemen, and he is more than just a caricature, for he is observed below the surface as well as on it.

The dramatist's greatest work of poetic imagination, 'Peer Gynt,' is likewise a satirical comedy, with only occasional notes of pathos. Peer, that engaging rascal, always gets out of his scrapes,—even his last one, the encounter with the Button Molder. It is unfortunate that many of us derive our first emotional impressions of this work not from Ibsen but from Grieg, since the latter's incidental music is, in my opinion, almost wholly out of key with the poem. Grieg was a sentimental Romantic; Ibsen, in this play, was a realistic satirist. The play is full of fantasy, but the fantasy is never an escape from reality, like that of the Romantic; on the contrary, it is exactly a satire on Romantic escapism. Grieg's dirge for Aase's death is one of unbroken funereal gloom, whereas that scene in the play is exactly a flight *from* gloom, and all unpleasant realities, on the part of Peer, who transports his dying mother in an imaginary sleigh-ride to Soria Moria castle, west of the moon and east of the sun. The mingling of pathos and irony

[8] 'som har fåt nåde og magt og evne til at *ønske* noget, *begaere* noget, *ville* noget, så ihaerdigt og så unbonhørligt—at de *må* få det tilslut.'

[9] T. Blanc, *Henrik Ibsen og Christiania Theater 1850-1899* (Christiania, 1906).

[10] If we take the figures only from the season when 'A Doll's House' was first performed (1879-80) to the end of the century, the order is 'The League' first, (74 performances), 'A Doll's House' second (73), 'The Vikings' third (72), and 'Peer Gynt' fifth (50). In those years fourth place went to 'Love's Comedy' (another comedy), with 53 performances.

and fantasy in this scene is beyond praise, a work of supreme creative genius. There is no adequate word for it, but 'gloomy' is certainly inadequate.

How gloomy is 'The Wild Duck?' We cannot do better than listen to the master of modern comedy, Bernard Shaw. In 1897, when he was dramatic critic of the *Saturday Review*, he wrote:

> Where shall I find an epithet magnificent enough for "The Wild Duck"! To sit there getting deeper and deeper into that Ekdal home, and getting deeper and deeper into your own life all the time, until you forget that you are in a theatre at all; to look on with horror and pity at a profound tragedy, shaking with laughter all the time at an irresistible comedy; to go out, not from a diversion, but from an experience deeper than real life ever brings to most men, or often brings to any man: that is what "The Wild Duck" was like last Monday at the Globe.[11]

And even the most virulently hostile of the English critics of that time, Clement Scott, unintentionally supports Shaw. The play was 'so absurd,' he reported, 'that even the champions of Ibsen could not help laughing at it'![12]

'A Doll's House'? Well, most of us get our notions of it from nineteenth century stage traditions, and from the title of Ibsen's preliminary study, which he called 'Notes for the Modern Tragedy.'[13] But his method was to begin with a serious abstract theme, and then develop it in terms of characters. And as he worked at his characters they came alive. In time (and he regularly spent two years on a play) they acquired a reality in his imagination that was almost a materialization. A friend once asked him how he happened to choose the commonplace name Nora. 'He answered easily without reflection: "You know, she was actually called Leonora, but everybody called her Nora; she was the pet of the family." '[14] And Mrs. Ibsen once told this friend, 'One day Ibsen surprised her by saying, "I have just seen Nora. She came right here to me and laid her hand on my shoulder." "How was she dressed?" asked Mrs. Ibsen,—a truly feminine question. Ibsen answered with immense seriousness, "She wore a simple blue wool dress." '[15]

Now, the better he knew his characters, the more fully he saw them as actual people, the less his theme remained morally black and white, as it does with ordinary writers of problem plays, and the more the play became a human tragicomical mixup of good and bad intentions, mistakes rather than sins, without hero or villain. Nora, as she turned out, became not the heroine that ambitious stars always try to portray her, but a far from flawless human being. Nor is Helmer the villain deserving of hisses that stage tradition tends to make him. Professor H. J. Weigand has written an extended and admirable defense for the tragicomical interpretation. 'If we see Torvald,' he sums up, 'as neither a cad nor a villain, but as a worthy, honest citizen as citizens go, a careful provider, a doting husband, unimaginative, but scarcely a shade less so than the average male, self-complacent and addicted to heroic stage-play—a habit fostered by the uncritical adoration of his mate; if Nora is to us not the tragic heroine as which she is commonly pictured, but an irresistibly bewitching piece of femininity, an extravagant poet and romancer, utterly lacking in sense of fact, and endowed with a natural gift for play-acting which makes her instinctively dramatize her experiences:—how can the settle-

[11] *Dramatic Opinions and Essays* 2, 97.

[12] Shaw, *The Quintessence of Ibsenism* (New York, 1917) 209.

[13] 'Optegnelser til nutids-tragedien.' *Efterladte Skrifter* 2, 327.

[14] J. Paulsen, *Nye Erindringer* (Copenhagen, 1901) 130.

[15] Paulsen, *Samliv med Ibsen*, Anden Samling (Copen-Hagen and Christiania, 1913) 60.

ment fail of a fundamentally comic appeal?'[16] Now that we are no longer agitated by the question of women's rights, 'A Doll's House' can at last be enjoyed not as a problem play nor as a tragedy but as a high comedy of character,—a comedy of timeless vitality. But to be so enjoyed it must get a kind of theatrical interpretation foreign from tradition.

Yes, but what of 'Ghosts' that tragedy traditionally regarded as the *ne plus ultra* of unmitigated, inspissated gloom? A recent university performance, directed by Henry Schnitzler, is evidence in point. Mr. Schnitzler interpreted the text as it was written. Lo and behold, the audience responded by intense interest, as was to be expected, and—by frequent laughter. The laughter was not out of place, for it rose from the appreciation of Ibsen's ironic and deeply penetrating revelation of human character. Jacob Engstrand is indeed almost too Dickensian a caricature of a pious fraud to be wholly fitting in a play otherwise so devastatingly realistic in its character-portrayal. The scene in which he gets around Pastor Manders is highly comic. As for Manders, he is much less the detestable stage cleric of tradition than the 'great baby' that Mrs. Alving calls him,—whom we can laugh at, as she does, even though, unlike that generous lady, we have no desire to kiss him. And consider Regina's single-minded pursuit of the available male. At the opening of Act I she is talking with her supposed father, Engstrand, and she hears the pastor coming. 'Get out!' she orders. 'No, not that way. Down the kitchen stairs with you! Then, as the stage direction tells us, she 'glances hastily at herself in the mirror, dusts herself with her pocket handkerchief, and settles her collar.' (To-day the business would be with lipstick and powder puff.) When Manders enters she pretends to be 'surprised and pleased.' Gone is the harsh vulgarity of her tone with Engstrand; now she irradiates shy sweetness. 'No, really! Good morning, Pastor Manders.' She is solicitous in helping him off with his coat, tucking him into a chair, and getting a footstool for his feet. 'There! are you comfortable now, sir?' Manders, gratified, essays a careful compliment. 'Do you know, Miss Engstrand, I positively think you have grown since I saw you last.' Regina, simpering: 'Do you think so, sir? Mrs. Alving says my figure has developed too.' One can hear the pastor's embarrassed throat-clearing. 'Developed? Well, perhaps a little; just enough.' There is a pause after that, as well there might be.

My study of Ibsen's irony, mentioned earlier, has shown, I think, that an ironic point of view is either explicit or implicit in almost all Ibsen's work from 'Catiline' to 'When We Dead Awaken.' And irony, as I understand it, is a mingling, at one and the same time, of the comic and the painful. A person or situation is perceived to be at one ridiculous and pitiful. Or the ludicrous aspect of things is juxtaposed to the bitterness of the perception of human weakness and folly. Or the character's high hopes are contrasted with dire fate that, as we of the audience know, the jesting gods are preparing for him. Irony is comedy with a taste of wormwood, or tragedy with a wry smile. The wry smile, amusement distorted by pain, is its visible sign.

Ibsen came by his irony through a conflict which lay at the very center of his nature,—a conflict between his emotional idealism and his intellectual realism. He was an ardent seeker after noble ends. He had indeed the impulses

[16] *The Modern Ibsen* (New York, 1925) 64.

of a Protestant preacher. But these impulses were frustrated because he lost the faith of his childhood when he reached his twenties. No doubt he lost his faith mainly because in the contrary side of his nature he was a penetrating and detached observer and examiner of others, and chiefly of himself. His well-known quatrain tells us so:

> What is life? A fighting
> In heart and brain with Trolls.
> Poetry? That means writing
> Doomsday accounts of our souls.

Elsewhere I have compared him with Euripides, and concluded that those two were the most ironic of the great dramatists, for both were bitter and disillusioned idealists, and at the same time both possessed the intellectual detachment to observe their predicament with wry amusement.

Ibsen liked a joke, and if his youth had been happier, this trait would certainly have been more obvious. A schoolmate remembered him as 'the little schoolboy with the good head, the deep understanding, the somewhat sharp, irritable temper, somewhat testy disposition, the caustic tongue, the satirical talent, but at the same time friendly and sociable.'[17]

But his father failed in business, and from the child's eighth year the family lived in poverty. At sixteen Henrik left home to earn his living, as a druggist's apprentice in a village far from his native town. In this village he spent the last five years of his minority, and he was lonely and melancholy enough, as the verses he wrote during the period, preserved in his posthumous works, abundantly show. At the same time he learned to dance, fell in and out of love, fathered an illegitimate child, and won a couple of worshipping friends and a circle of cronies who used to gather at his room of nights to drink punch out of salve cups and roar over his satirical drawings and verses. Thus he drew a picture of a local swain kissing his horse, under the intoxicated impression that the beast was his sweetheart.[18]

In 1851 the youth went to the Norwegian capital to try to enter the university. He was, as we would say, 'conditioned' in certain subjects and did not become a regular student, but busied himself in writing. He became a contributor to a satirical weekly. At that time a certain liberal politician, Stabell by name, abandoned the workingmen's movement that he had championed and went over to the Conservative majority, to the outrage of Ibsen and his young friends. Ibsen thereupon sat down and composed 'Norma, or a Politician's Love,' 'music-drama in three acts,' with a preface in which the author told how he sat one day in the gallery of the Storting (the Norwegian parliament) and daydreamed. There, in those 106 heads beneath him was the quintessence of Norway's spiritual endowment. 'Here,' he wrote, 'are found Genius, Eloquence, Patriotism, Liberalism, heaped together in compact masses.' In the evening he went to the opera 'Norma' and got an inspiration: the plot of the opera could apply to the Storting, and Stabell would naturally be the hero, as his character was such that he would be the last person expected in that role. Ibsen fitted other politicians to the other roles, and worked out a burlesque which even to a reader distant both in time and space has considerable comic vigor. The hero

[17] Quoted from B. Ording by J. B. Halvorsen, article 'Ibsen' in *Norsk Forfatter-Lexicon* (Christiania, 1892).

[18] Christopher Due, *Erindringer fra Henrik Ibsens Ungdomsaar* (Copenhagen, 1909) 28ff. The 'horse' anecdote is from A. E. Zucker, *Ibsen, the Master Builder* (London 1930)35. Zucker notes that he visited Grimstad, the village in question, and got some material not in print.

GROUP DYNAMICS—HOPE OR HOAX?

Robert Gray Gunderson

AT the 1949 Convention of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Dr. Mayhew Derryberry, an official of the United States Department of Health, addressed the discussion section on 'the science of group dynamics.' Since Dr. Derryberry unhappily failed to define what he meant by *group dynamics*, one of his listeners was provoked to damn the term as nothing more than a ritualistic shibboleth. Less critical observers pointed out, however, that group dynamics is the theory held by a number of educationists, social psychologists, sociologists, and welfare workers who claim they have discovered a method for the application of 'science' to the process of human relations. Implicit in their use of the word *dynamics* is, of course, the analogy between physical laws of motion and the relation of forces within social groups. Exponents hypothesize 'a psychical motion' in group discussion just as physicists postulate the motion of molecules in physical bodies. If their concept is somewhat mysterious, it must remain so temporarily—for, as two of the leaders have confessed, 'The science of group dynamics is so young that only a very meagre number of scientific facts and laws have been accumulated.'[1]

1

The founder of the dynamics movement was the late Dr. Kurt Lewin, who came to the United States from Germany in 1932. Educated in the *Gestalt* school of psychology in the Fatherland, Lewin expounded configurationist doctrine at Duke, Cornell, Stanford, Iowa, and Massachusetts Institute of Technology before his death in February, 1947. In a memorial tribute, Edward C. Tolman proclaimed that 'in the future history of our psychological era there are two names which will stand out above all others: those of Freud and Lewin.' Echoing the same sentiment, Gordon W. Allport observed that 'after Freud, we think of McDougal and Kurt Lewin.'[2] While most psychologists would be less generous in their praise, many would agree that Lewin did much to make configurationism popular in America. In his application of *Gestalttheorie*, he originated the concepts of 'topological' and 'vector' psychology, and coined the terms 'action research,' 'cognitive structure,' and 'group dynamics.'[3]

The theory of group dynamics is but an outgrowth of Lewin's topological psychology. Taking issue with the early behaviorists, Lewin contended that human behavior must be related not only to physiological needs, but also to what he described as a *'much more complex*

ROBERT GRAY GUNDERSON *is an Assistant Professor of Speech at Oberlin College.* *This article is based upon a paper presented at the Ohio Conference for Speech Education in Columbus in October, 1949.*

[1] Leland P. Bradford and John R. P. French, Jr., Conclusions, *The Journal of Social Issues*, 4 (Spring, 1948).71.

[2] Edward C. Tolman, Kurt Lewin—1890-1947, *Psychological Review*, 55 (January, 1948).4; Gordon W. Allport, The Genius of Kurt Lewin, *The Journal of Social Issues*, Supplement No. 1 (December, 1948).14. For other tributes, see Alfred J. Marrow, Ibid. 27ff., and Ronald Lippitt, Kurt Lewin, 1890-1947, Adventures in the Exploration of Interdependence, *Sociometry*, 10 (February, 1947).87-97.

[3] Tolman, *Psychological Review*, 55.3-4. The contributions of *Gestalt* psychology have been debated in three QJS articles: W. M. Parrish, Implications of *Gestalt* Psychology, 14 (February, 1928).8-29; Giles Wilkeson Gray, *Gestalt*, Behavior, and Speech, 14 (June, 1928).334-59; and R. M. Ogden, *'Gestalt*, Behavior, and Speech', 14 (November, 1928).530-4.

. . . *variable—the total situation as organized or structured by the organism.*'[4] In the case of hunger, for example, Lewin felt that behavior is not governed solely by the 'inner needs' of the individual. Instead, he maintained that food and intervening barriers to food contribute to the total and complex 'configuration.' In measuring such complexities, Lewin was hampered by the inadequacy of statistical methods which provide correlations between only a few variables in isolation from the total situation. Consequently, he turned to topological mathematics for tools which he might use in demonstrating the 'interrelations between *complex patterns of variables.*'[5] Thus, he utilized topological diagrams to demonstrate relationships which were too complicated for the usual statistical procedures.[6] Through the use of this new approach, Lewin expected to gather and explain, as he put it, 'reliable data on the structural properties of groups, on the relations between groups or sub-groups, and on the relation between a group and the life of its individual members.'[7] 'Only a man of Lewin's originality and courage,' said one sympathetic critic, 'could have [contributed] . . . the notion that actual experiments on groups could be carried out under precisely controlled conditions.'[8]

2

Current leaders in the dynamics movement come from several disciplines and delight in defying traditional academic boundaries. One of Lewin's students, Ronald Lippitt, performs the rituals of the order at the University of Michigan. Leland P. Bradford, Director of Adult Education for the National Education Association, and Kenneth Benne of the Education Department at the University of Illinois promote the cause among professional educators. Social workers hear of it from Gordon Hearn of the Department of Social Welfare at the University of California. Farmers have had dynamics translated for them by D. M. Hall of the Extension Service of the University of Illinois.[9] Labor unionists have been exposed to it through the writings of Clinton Golden.[10] Members of the speech profession hear it expounded by John Keltner of the University of Oklahoma.

While speech teachers have been slow to join the movement, they have not been unaware of the activities of Lewin and his followers. At the forthcoming Rocky Mountain Speech Conference, for example, Dr. P. Merville Larson announces that 'some of the newer principles of group dynamics' will be 'explored.' A joint committee of the NEA Department of Adult Education and the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA has served as a meeting ground for speech teachers and exponents of dynamics.[11] Magazines such as *The Journal of Social Issues*, *Sociatry*, *Sociometry*, and *Human Relations* have publicized the work of the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the University of Michigan.

[4] Robert W. Leeper, *Lewin's Topological and Vector Psychology: A Digest and a Critique*, (Eugene, Oregon, 1943)28.

[5] Ibid. 33-4.

[6] See Kurt Lewin, *A Dynamic Theory of Personality*, trans. into English by Donald K. Adams and Karl E. Zener (New York, 1935); and Kurt Lewin, *Principles of Topological Psychology*, (New York, 1936).

[7] Kurt Lewin, Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibria and Social Change, *Human Relations*, 1 (1947).8.

[8] Tolman, *Psychological Review*, 55 (1948)-4.

[9] See D. M. Hall, *The Dynamics of Group Discussion*, University of Illinois Extension Service, *Bulletin*, 1948.

[10] While Clinton Golden has been associated with the dynamics group, his book, written in collaboration with Harold J. Ruttenberg, *The Dynamics of Industrial Democracy*, (New York, 1942), does not outline the usual doctrine.

[11] The committee met at the 1949 Annual Conference of the Department of Adult Education in Cleveland, October 24-26.

the Sociometric Institute in New York City, and the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations in London.

Even better known, no doubt, is the work of the National Training Laboratory on Group Development which has met for the past three summers in Bethel, Maine. For three weeks each summer some 150 persons described as 'key education and action leaders' have gathered for a 'workshop' in group dynamics. Their objectives were (1) to provide research scientists an opportunity to communicate information to discussion leaders; (2) to give successful participation in democratic group processes; and (3) to offer an experimental laboratory for further research.[12] Delegates were subjected to a rigorous testing program which included the Vigotsky, the Rorschach, and the Runner-Seaver personality inventories.[13] An anthropologist was appointed to 'secure anecdotal material on the cultural aspects of the laboratory community,' and two psychiatrists were assigned as councilors.[14]

3

A basic device of the Bethel laboratory was an adaptation of J. L. Moreno's psychodrama called *role playing*—which (according to Moreno's evaluation) is comparable only to the dramaturgical contributions of Aeschylus and Euripides:

> Aeschylus is credited with having put the first actor upon . . . the stage. . . . Euripides credited with having put the second actor on the stage. . . . We may be credited to have put the psyche itself on the stage.[15]

To get 'the psyche itself on the stage' at Bethel, delegates gathered in 'Basic Skill Training Groups' of twelve to fourteen and 'spontaneously acted out human relations situations.'[16] 'BST Groups' would dramatize, for example, a crisis in a small town PTA. Various members would be assigned roles as the disgruntled parent, the harassed school principal, and the timid teacher. 'Behind the partial protection of the role,' it was noted, 'members became quite frank in expressing their perceptions . . . .'[17] After successfully mastering the problems of the hypothetical PTA, delegates felt competent to direct similar dramatizations before 'real-life' PTA's back home. As the Director, Leland Bradford, expressed it, 'The laboratory aimed to be an experiment in the training of trainers.'[18]

In a different use of the role-playing device, members would dramatize the various personality types in a poor discussion meeting. Delegates would portray the parts of 'the aggressor,' 'the blocker,' 'the recognition-seeker,' 'the special-interest pleader,' 'the scape-goat,' and 'the blamer.' Then, for contrast, a good discussion would be enacted in which the various phases of effective leadership would be demonstrated. Members would play the roles of 'change-agent,' 'changee,' 'initiator,' 'encourager,' 'harmonizer,' 'facilitator,' 'orienter,' 'fact-seeker,' 'expediter,' 'compromiser,' analyzer,' and so on through a long list of commendable attributes. This use of role playing is somehow

[12] National Training Laboratory on Group Development, *Preliminary Report*, Bethel, Maine, June 16 to July 4, 1947, iii. See also the *Report of the Second Summer Laboratory Session*.

[13] *Preliminary Report*, 24.

[14] *School and Society*, 66 (December 20, 1947), 475-9.

[15] J. L. Moreno, Psychodrama and Group Psychotherapy, *Sociometry*, 9 (May-August, 1946).253. For a more extended treatment of the Moreno doctrine, see his *Who Shall Survive? A New Approach to the Problem of Human Interrelations*, (Washington, 1934).

[16] Leland P. Bradford, Human Relations Training, *The Group*, 10 (January, 1948).9.

[17] Margaret E. Barron and Gilbert K. Krulee, Case Study of a Basic Skill Training Group, *The Journal of Social Issues*, 4 (Spring, 1948).25.

[18] *Preliminary Report*,. 4.

reminiscent of the medieval morality plays which dramatized the seven deadly sins in contrast to the cardinal virtues.

While role playing is neither new nor the invention of the dynamics group, nevertheless, it may have limited use as a device for teaching relatively simple skills in speech and behavior.[19] The adolescent male might well learn conventional courtesies by impersonating Beau Brummell. There may be even a bit of psychiatric benefit in having some shrew play the role of a timid school marm. But the inherent artificiality—if not actual mockery—involved in the process makes role playing absurd as a method for the discussion and solution of serious public questions.

A second device used extensively at Bethel is known, rather inelegantly, as 'feedback.' 'Feedback,' says David H. Jenkins, 'is the procedure by which the group can become aware of its own difficulties, the reasons for those difficulties and the corrections which are necessary.'[20] In other circles, feedback is known as the process of evaluation. A 'group observer' was assigned to record the content of the Bethel discussions; an 'interaction observer' classified the relationship between members in twenty categories ranging from praise to aggression; and an 'anecdotal observer' interpreted the dynamics of group and leader behavior. After each discussion these functionaries reported their observations, and members collaborated by making critical suggestions. Published transcriptions of feedback sessions indicate that members occasionally pursued self-evaluation almost to the point of self-abasement.[21] Nevertheless, delegates at Bethel have served to emphasize the importance of analyzing discussion procedures.

At Bethel, other techniques were used which are quite familiar to teachers of speech. An intensive testing program preceded formation of the discussion groups. Once the groups were at work, observers prepared charts which indicated the distribution of member participation. After meetings, members were asked to fill out questionnaires which research students later used as aids in evaluation. On the basis of this evidence, sociograms were constructed which represented graphically the likes and dislikes members held for one another. While the use of such techniques would seem to be routine experimental procedure, the Bethelites apparently feel that they have happened upon new ritual.

4

Whether or not group dynamics is a hope or a hoax may be determined by an analysis of its vocabulary. A group with pretensions of scientific objectivity might be expected to develop a precise terminology. Instead, one finds a conglomeration of loosely defined terms chosen from the sporting arena, the theatre and the fraternity lounge—as well as from the scientific laboratory. Terms with popular connotations such as 'gate-keeper,' 'blocker,' 'role player,' and 'play boy,' are thus mingled with the vocabulary of topological and vector psychology. This conglomerate language leads not only to confusion in communication; it precludes scientific measurement.

[19] Most articles on role playing are concerned with relatively elementary problems in behavior. See Bruce F. Young and Morris Rosenberg, Role Playing as a Participation Technique, *The Journal of Social Issues*, 5 (Winter, 1949).42-5; Lillian Wald Kay, Role Playing as a Teaching Aid, *Sociometry*, 10 (May, 1947).165-7; and Dan H. Cooper, The Potentialities of Sociometry for School Administration, Ibid. 111-21.

[20] David H. Jenkins, Feedback and Group Self-Evaluation, *The Journal of Social Issues*, 4 (Spring, 1948).51.

[21] Barron and Krulee, Case Study, in Ibid. 25ff.

Even if it were granted that the research expert in dynamics could define what he wished to measure, he still would lack measuring instruments worthy of the name. Personality inventories, interviewing techniques, and sociometric devices may be interesting experimental tools, but they hardly can be called accurate measuring devices. In a survey of seventy-nine 'well-known' psychologists, Arthur Kornhauser found that all but a small minority considered such inventories of doubtful value for practical use. 'None of these [personality] tests,' replied one respondent, 'has been adequately validated against satisfactory outside criteria.' Another respondent opined that 'a few, probably not more than a dozen [of some 500], could be recommended for experimental use.' Another complained that there was 'too much cultism and intuition and too few cold facts' in the Rorschach technique.[22]

[22] Arthur Kornhauser, Replies of Psychologists to a Short Questionnaire on Mental Test Developments, Personality Inventories, and the Rorschach Test, *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 5 (Spring, 1945).3-15. Here is a summary of Kornhauser's survey of personality inventories:

'In the field of personality testing, how satisfactory or helpful for practical use do you consider: (a) Personality inventories and questionnaires (such as those of Bernreuter, Bell, Humm-Wadsworth, etc.)? (b) The Rorschach test?'

	No. Question	% (a)	No. Question	% (b)
'Highly Satisfactory'	1	1.5	0	0.0
'Moderately Satisfactory'	9	13.5	12	20.0
'Doubtfully Satisfactory'	24	36.0	17	29.0
'Rather Unsatisfactory'	22	33.0	13	22.0
'Highly Unsatisfactory'	11	16.0	17	29.0
[Replies not tabulated]	12		15	

5

In spite of the skepticism of their colleagues in psychology, exponents of dynamics insist that there are 'structural properties in groups' which can be analyzed objectively and measured accurately.[23] While in no case have they described clearly what the structural properties and relationships might be, nevertheless, they assiduously work at 'action research' in 'human relations.' The world community is their workshop, and Lewin's topological psychology exempts them from the rigors of the controlled laboratory situation. The observer crowds into the test tube with his experiment—but proximity to emotional flame cannot destroy his objectivity because of some magic inherent in 'the science of group dynamics.'

For those without the magic formula, there remain the difficult but prosaic methods of a psychology which demands controlled experimentation, carefully defined terminology, and an honest recognition of limitations. In the end, these virtues may contribute more to scientific progress than premature proclamations about 'the science of human relations.'

[23] Kurt Lewin, *Human Relations*, 1 (1947).8. The 'best comprehensive survey of Lewin's thinking is *Resolving Social Conflicts, Selected Papers on Group Dynamics*, ed. by Gertrud Weiss Lewin, (New York, 1948). See particularly Chapter 5, 'Experiments in Social Space.'

OBJECTIVE MEANING AND DRAMATIC INTERPRETATION

Herbert Leigh Smith

IN recent years, the development of techniques in both acting and oral reading (and their exposition) has been manifold, but the discrimination of significant meaning has still, by and large, been left to the individual and private 'impressions' of the student or teacher. This condition appears to persist in spite of the fact that during the same period we have had the benefit of considerable thought with reference to meaning in literature (the work of I. A. Richards, T. C. Pollock, and others), and further despite the considered opinions of scholars who expressed themselves in this field directly a number of years ago. It has been some time, for instance, since W. M. Parrish demolished the adherents of *individual expression* on a tolerably imposing scale in his Objective Literary Standards In Interpretation,[1] and yet the state of affairs which he protested is still greatly with us; the 'nightmare' of which Gilbert Murray spoke has not passed.

Witness as one indication of this the recent QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH article by Miss Lorraine Nauss,[2] bringing forth once again this pedagogical doctrine of *individual expression* under the heading of Reading The Language of Literature. Apparently Parrish did not fully register, or at least what he said must be repeated, in essence, from time to time. The task is made easier for me by the relatively recent work of Thomas Clark Pollock,[3] which merits detailed consideration in the field of literary interpretation in speech.

I

I do not hope to bring forward a formula which will definitively scotch the proponents of *private impression* and *individual expression* in the realm of interpretation, nor do I wish to suggest that *private impression*, i.e., highly personal response, cannot play a significant part in interpretative technique; I wish only to raise a question or two concerning the value of an attempt to discern a common, or *public* meaning in interpretative literature. The theory and practice of interpretation may have complex bases. The assertion here is that discernment of *public meaning* is primary, is fundamental, is not optional.

This effort, then, is directed against those who insist, concerning a selection for interpretation: 'this means what it means to me,' who affirm with respect to meaning that the only correct interpretation possible is the individual, private interpretation, and that with meaning the guiding rule should be what some assert it to be with critical evaluation—*de gustibus est non disputandum.*

It is not possible to discuss all of the questions raised by Miss Nauss in this connection; the whole argument of this paper is more concerned with raising other questions. But one cannot comply with her somewhat importunate request that discussion of this matter should be advanced 'on the premise . . . that literature is essentially a primitive usage of language, a mode of behavior in a particular situation, not an intellectualized abstraction from experience.'[4]

HERBERT LEIGH SMITH *is an Instructor in Drama and Associate Director of Dramatic Activitites at Syracuse University.*

[1] QJS 22 (1936).3.

[2] QJS 33 (1947).474-9.

[3] T. C. Pollock, *The Nature of Literature* (Princeton, 1941).

[4] QJS 33 (1947).479.

It can be tentatively agreed that *literary* usage is, in this context or that, distinct from *scientific* usage, but to label *literature* as 'essentially a primitive usage,' and 'not an intellectualized abstraction,' is at least to disregard certain aspects of modern literature, and is moreover to look upon literature more as a distinct *entity* than as a usage, form, or *part of* language generally, with the implication that there is little significant interplay between *scientific* usage and *literary* usage. We should not forget which is the whole, and which are the parts. Literature is one kind, or use, of language; literature is not a pursuit which *makes use of* another entity, language.

Although observing that 'we cannot actually dichotomize language usage,' Miss Nauss has gone on to suggest that the two principal usages are divergent in direction, which position might be tentatively agreed to, but she has pressed them in their divergence to the point where she comprehends them separately, and not in their interplay. It should also be borne in mind that these categories or usages of language, while the outcome of recent semantic thought, are working hypotheses only, not established linguistic facts. At this point, I should wish to limit myself to the suggestion that whatever else it is, language is certainly a dynamic human phenomenon, subject in all its uses to modification, interaction, and change, in which the influence of the various forms and usages upon each other must be of the greatest significance. It is possible that the various usages are now divergent, now convergent, and that they cross, fuse, and find new directions as a consequence of all their interactions. The validity of this suggestion would appear to be established by the obvious fact of language change, most of which would be rather difficult to account for apart from the impact of other language.

But this is something of a digression. My central point here is simply a restatement of the almost universally accepted idea that the *primary* function of language generally is communication (the nature of *what* it communicates not concerning us for the present), and the extension of that idea to the specific ground of literary language. In this view, the *primary* responsibility of any interpreter is to discern the author's full meaning, and interpretative techniques should follow from the desire to communicate that meaning to the listener as fully as possible. These techniques will of course be modified and controlled to an appreciable extent by the nature of the matter communicated.

I submit that the meanings of literary language are for all their complexity none the less open to objective analysis. While it has become common to state that the full meaning of literature can be understood only in terms of its own symbolism, I am suggesting that the workings of that symbolism can be analyzed, and that such analysis should throw open an approach to the discernment of objective, intended meaning. In support of this opinion, I have drawn heavily upon the work of T. C. Pollock.

A brief word must be spoken about educational value. If the student is to be taught to extract meaning and to assist in its communication, he will be most effectively motivated if he can be convinced that something of educational value is thereby accomplished. Otherwise the quest for meaning will likely not develop beyond the point of academic exercise. The argument of this educational value must derive principally from the belief that whatever its other purposes are, the *first* business of education is to further the increase of knowledge and understanding, plus a concomitant assumption that the masters of

prose and poetry have a meaning to communicate which will facilitate that increase. While some teachers may view this belief as heresy, it is also probable that a greater number will hold it to be so obvious an educational truth that they will wonder at the necessity of its statement.

2

The assertion has already been made that language is a process of communication. In broader definition, what are the actual aspects of the process? Both Pollock and I. A. Richards would agree that the linguistic process is three-fold, consisting of an experience on the part of one individual, which he attempts to express by putting it into symbols, which bring about an experience or response on the part of another individual. This communication is said to be successful to the degree that the experience of the latter individual is similar to that of the former. In brief, language is seen as a process of the social communication of individual experience.

In his earlier works, it will be remembered, Richards divided the functions of language into two—the *referential* and the *emotive*. The referential, or scientific use is that where the words are 'symbols' employed to refer to things or states such as can be directly discerned. There is a 'referent' which is the object of the 'reference' to it of the word-symbol. The *emotive* use of language is that usage which is employed for the sake of affect upon the emotions or attitudes of the recipient of the communication. Richards subsequently amended these categories, but Pollock's criticism of this early two-fold division is the best departure point for the matter under discussion here.

Pollock finds this general view of language usage to be defective in a number of ways: It throws more emphasis upon referential communication than upon emotive, which might lead us to assume that the problems of the former were more important than those of the latter; it also groups a number of different uses of language together as 'emotive'. At the same time, its classifications are made in terms of a few elements taken from the experiential whole.

Pollock's division of the uses of language is three-fold: 1) Phatic Communion, 2) Referential Symbolism, 3) Evocative Symbolism. Leaving out Phatic Communion as not necessary to this study, we come to Referential Symbolism, which is divided into Pure and Pragmatic. Pollock's Pure Referential Symbolism is close to the Referential Symbolism of Richards—it is language leading to the discrimination of a referent. The Pragmatic is that which further stimulates the recipient to activity or attitudes concerning the referents. It contains a language function which Richards would have classified as emotive.

Pollock has also advanced two other sharply defined concepts which must be inserted here. They are literature (L) and experience (E).

> Experience (E) is the full psycho-physiological experience of any individual at any particular time.[5]

> Literature (L) is the linguistic process through which . . . [the] experience (E) of one person leads to the production of a series of symbols which in turn evoke in another person a controlled experience (E) . . . similar to, though not identical with, the experience (E) which resulted in the production of the symbol series.[6]

Accepting these definitions as bases, we are interested in Pollock's definition of Evocative Symbolism, as it appears to be one of the most comprehensive explanations thus far advanced concerning meaning in literature. According to this definition, a writer uses words to evoke 'a controlled experience (E) in another: if

[5] Pollock, 55.
[6] Ibid., 141.

he does this in order to express an experience (E) of his own, the usage is literature (L): if his concern, however, is only to evoke an experience (E) in the other, the use is *pseudo-literature.*'[7]

This gives us not only a definition, but another argument for public discernment of meaning. For *pseudo-literature,* by his definition, is that which seeks only to evoke an experience (E) which is *already desired by the reader;* the category includes 'pulp' and 'slick' reading material (fictional), etc. Consequently, if in the interpretation of literature (L), whose distinction lies in the fact that it is based upon the experience (E) of the *author,* we seek to transfer the emphasis to the *reader's* experience (E), it should be apparent that we run the risk of equating genuine literature with pseudo-literature.

Pollock has also provided us with a discussion of six principal means which are at the disposal of the writer who attempts to use evocative symbolism, plus a consideration of the patterns of experience which the writer's words may evoke in the reader. These last can be summarized as: 1) direct transcript of perception and reflection, 2) a counterpart of an imaginary chain of events, 3) an allegory, and 4) an 'objective correlative' (as defined by T. S. Eliot).

It is not possible within the scope of this article to do fuller justice to Pollock's ideas. The reader who desires greater elaboration will find these latter questions discussed in Chapter 7 of *The Nature of Literature.*

3

But even such a brief summary should serve to demonstrate two things: 1. That any attempt to approach literature through the *literal sense-meaning* alone, i.e., the application of Pure Referential Symbolism, will fail, and 2. that modern literature shows a degree of complexity which could scarcely be accounted for by calling its processes merely an *essentially primitive* usage, or *behavior-action-situation* usage, as suggested by Miss Nauss.

In actuality, Miss Nauss is concerned with one of the problems of this highly intellectualized and complex evocative symbolism when she says 'there is no general emotion, as for instance, *fear* or *joy,* as these abstract, conceptualized words would indicate. There are only *particular fears,* as the particular-fear-of-an-oncoming-train, or . . . *particular joys,* as the particular-joy-of-reunion-with-a-particular-longlost-friend. . . .[8]

But this issue is not solely concerned with words of *emotional content* or *subjective reference.* Actually, there is no general referent for such seemingly simple words as *tree* or *ball.* In the experiential view, there is only this-particular-tree-on-the-riverbank, or that particular-eight-ball-in-the-side-pocket. Like *tree* and *ball, fear* and *joy* are words which denote certain sets of experiential phenomena having common attributes—one would even hesitate to specify which represented the higher level of abstraction—and they are none the less comprehensible for all their subjectivity and intangibility. As symbols, they have a place in a complex evocative symbolism which is sometimes rendered possible by their very *separability;* the comprehension of this symbolism will likely be more retarded than advanced by any reversion to primitive inseparable concepts, effected by an indiscriminate use of the hyphen.

4

On the basis of the foregoing, let me suggest two methods which might be

[7] Ibid., 196.

[8] QJS 33 (1947) 478.

usable in an approach to this problem of meaning and interpretation.

1. Analysis of any literary item for the evocative means employed, probably most profitable after the majority of the members of the class could agree that they had received a common meaning or set of closely similar meanings.

2. Comparison to discover whether or not the pattern of experience evoked was the same in a number of cases.

Finally, what answering suggestions are there for the individual interpreters who 'object'? At least two occur, in addition to the partial arguments thus far advanced.

1. Language is an instrument of social communication, a tool in the hands of a social being. If he would bring about his own best integration in society, no individual is *at liberty* to persist in private discrimination of meaning. If an individual persists in private discrimination where *referential* symbolism is concerned, he either shortly ceases to exist, or is shut up in an asylum. Where evocative symbolism is concerned, such behavior may be no more than a limiting factor with reference to the individual's personality-development, but that is precisely what he may be seeking to avoid, and is undesirable in any case.

2. The reason that the individual has a separate or disparate reaction—finds a private meaning—is related to the breadth of his general experience. Writer and reader or hearer must have some common ground of experience for communication to take place. It is of course necessary to go on the assumption that the experience which the writer has available is more valuable than, or at least will come as an addition to, the experience of the reader. If the individual is to benefit from the writer's greater or differing experience, he must attempt to receive it through a rearrangement of some of the components of his own experience, and if that fails, he must draw on the experience of others. He will thereby have increased his own experience materially. The alternative of private discrimination leaves the individual precisely *where he was before*. Instead of making an effort to respond to the symbolism of the author, he will have reshuffled the author's symbolism to correspond to his own previous experience.

Confronted with a piece of poetry, a dramatic passage, or a literary narration, the student of dramatic interpretation will continue to inquire: 'What does this mean—what is this author trying to say?' If our only reply is to be: 'Well, now, what does it mean to you?' or 'The meaning is in the way you live through (survive?) the passage,' then the student is to be thrown back on merely his own previous experience and understanding. It seems to me that the business of interpretation and of education generally is rather to facilitate the increase of that understanding and experience as an essential accompaniment and prerequisite to the development of the individual personality.

LANTERN SLIDES AND SUCH

J. R. Van Pelt

THE chairman finished his introduction, and the principal speaker, Dr. Demosthenes Brown, stepped to the microphone. With skill born of long platform experience, he quickly gained the interest and confidence of the audience. His voice could be heard clearly, even back under the balcony. His eyes seemed to meet those of every listener. His whole dynamic personality was projected to every corner of the room.

Soon Dr. Brown was ready to get into the meat of his talk. It involved complex numerical data, so he had decided to use some lantern slides—a new undertaking for him. To insure accuracy, he had personally prepared the material for the slides. Today, before the session started, he had checked with the operator of the projector to make sure that everything was in readiness. Now, at a well-timed signal, the room lights were turned off.

In the resulting darkness, Dr. Brown and the audience lost sight of each other. This was something he had not anticipated; somehow he had overlooked the fact that 'eye contact' depends on visibility. In an effort to regain the ground thus lost, he raised his voice and put a little more life in it. This ought to have helped. But unfortunately, at that instant Dr. Brown turned away from the microphone to look at the image on the screen, and his amplified voice faded pathetically away. The good Doctor was annoyed with himself for making this elementary blunder, but he had no time to dwell on it, for this is what he saw on the screen:

Year	Average number of men at work on each scheduled working day	Total number of man-days worked	Total man-hours worked, based on net working time	Total man-hours worked, based on total time in the mine ('portal-to-portal' time)	Number of fatal injuries incurred while at work	Number of non-fatal injuries (lost-time accidents only)
1930	493,202	92,325,875	750,149,205	850,326,612	1,619	71,217
1931	450,274	73,349,461	595,979,561	674,845,333	1,080	53,975
1932	406,380	59,259,624	479,447,331	542,160,523	958	39,352
1933	418,752	69,881,999	564,425,166	638,100,656	833	43,946
1934	458,044	81,647,939	591,058,597	677,087,424	958	46,982
1935	462,354	82,291,724	578,511,200	665,019,499	968	47,529
1936	482,500	95,261,754	669,900,536	769,787,050	1,098	50,514
1937	490,771	96,130,313	675,568,195	776,548,688	1,198	52,847
1938	445,246	71,747,050	505,316,161	579,723,732	880	36,794
1939	445,044	78,966,259	554,984,350	636,802,063	867	38,544
1940	440,847	88,770,852	625,973,555	717,970,096	1,204	43,994
1941	457,744	97,999,557	691,049,388	791,396,491	1,072	46,637
1942	448,797	109,491,371	772,828,992	883,483,050	1,245	53,193
1943	407,135	106,911,764	777,970,318	883,675,272	1,225	51,067
1944	376,203	104,705,401	833,770,709	914,925,290	1,124	51,253
1945*	363,000	94,750,000	762,000,000	841,000,000	936	47,750
1946*	380,000	83,900,000	670,000,000	730,000,000	800	44,000

*Preliminary data, subject to revision

NUMBER OF MEN EMPLOYED, TOTAL MAN-HOURS OF EXPOSURE, AND NUMBER OF FATAL AND NON-FATAL INJURIES IN BITUMINOUS-COAL MINES (INCLUDING STRIP MINES) IN THE UNITED STATES, 1930-1946 INCLUSIVE

Dr. Brown paused in some dismay. Somehow the typing looked smaller than he had expected. Was the screen too small? No; he quickly realized that the trouble was with the slide.

'I'm sorry, ladies and gentlemen,' he

J. R. VAN PELT *is Supervisor of Research Education at Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus, Ohio. He has studied at Cornell College, Michigan College of Mines, and the University of Chicago and holds an honorary Doctor of Science degree from Cornell College. This article is based upon his observations of speakers at scientific meetings over a period of more than twenty-five years.*

heard himself saying, 'that this slide is so hard to read. But the figures are important, so I'll read them to you.' Someone called 'Focus!' The operator twiddled the focusing screw; the image blurred, then jumped into focus momentarily, then blurred again. Half a dozen helpful people called 'There you are!' or 'Hold it!'—but the operator (who, it seemed, was slightly nearsighted) turned the screw a little too far. As the jockeying continued, Dr. Brown tried to read the slide aloud. But it was too late; he had lost his audience. Instead of a unified and interested group, he had on his hands some apathetic people, some impatient ones, a few kibitzers near the projector, and a great many who had suddenly decided to converse audibly with their neighbors. Dr. Brown's heart sank as he realized that because of a few apparently trival details, he was 'flubbing' an important speech.

1

The further misfortunes of the eminent Dr. Brown with his newly made slides need not detain us; for other speakers have re-enacted them on a thousand platforms until they are well—too well—known to us all. We have seen overcrowded slides projected by machines that could not be focused. We have watched while speakers in a large room tried to use maps or charts that could not be read beyond arm's length. We have listened in vain as able scholars talked confidentially to a blackboard while writing illegible symbols with invisible chalk. We have fidgeted, mentally if not physically, as the remarks of a renowned scientist came to a dead stop while he adjusted some ill-arranged piece of apparatus or hunted for a scientific specimen to illustrate his point.

The habit of badly using bad visual aids is rampant among those who 'speak to inform.' It is an occupational disease of university professors. Severe epidemics break out at every scientific, engineering, and medical convention.

Someone has said that the hoof-and-mouth disease is endemic among college presidents. That would be serious except for the fact that there are only two thousand colleges, and each one has only one president. But the hoof-and-mouth disease sometimes spreads to other species; and when it does, it is often complicated by a heavy incidence of Whiffle's syndrome.

Whiffle is an organic chemist. He became so famous for his researches that every chemists' club wanted him to come and tell them the story. At the first few meetings of this kind, he just spoke. Then it occurred to him that diagrams of some of his big organic molecules would look impressive, so he had some slides made. In the slides, each atom in the molecule was shown by means of a small circle; lines connecting the circles showed how they were bonded together. That was fine at first, but as his research continued, he developed bigger and bigger molecules. To get them on a lantern slide, he had to make the scale of the drawings smaller and smaller. By the time the molecules got up to a few thousand atoms, the circles got so small that they looked like the dots of a half-tone engraving. Whiffle thought the slides seemed a trifle crowded, but he was busy, so he has been using them ever since.

Whiffle also wanted to show some of the smaller molecules in three dimensions. He couldn't do this on the screen, so he built cage-like models of the molecules out of wooden balls and stiff wire. With the balls and wire painted in different colors to represent different kinds of atoms and bonds, they were very im-

pressive, although it must be admitted that Whiffle displayed them more as a curiosity than as vital, concrete support for his talk. The audiences always duly admired the workmanship, but only one person ever asked any questions about the models. That was the young son of the presiding officer at one meeting who brought the boy along when the baby-sitter failed to show up. The boy's question was whether Whiffle didn't think they would make good cages for squirrels.

As time went on, other symptoms began to appear in Whiffle's talks—such as standing in front of what he had written on the blackboard, or passing around so many specimens that half the people in the audience would be busy handling them. Those readers who wish to investigate the full array of symptoms included in Whiffle's syndrome are referred to the exhaustive descriptions that have appeared in the journals devoted to abnormal psychology. Briefly, the symptoms all stem from Whiffle's apparent belief that visual aids automatically insure interest, understanding, and conviction.

At a recent meeting of some five hundred engineers at the Waldorf, a well-known consulting engineer showed a lantern slide with 120 lines of tabulated figures. Even though the screen was extra large, the typing was so small that the speaker couldn't read it even from his position right by the screen. He finally read most of it from his copy on the lectern—a process that consumed about ten minutes. The slide retaliated appropriately by cracking in the heat.

Professional societies and similar groups have been so plagued by such performances that several of them have prepared booklets or articles of instruction on the design and use of visual aids.[1] These instructions are fine for the serious student of Whiffle's syndrome, or for the man who wants to make a life-work of lantern slides and such. But for you and me, who prepare visual-aid material only once in a long time, they're just too complicated. What we need are some simple, usable principles that we can apply without recourse to higher mathematics.

2

Let's say that you are scheduled to give a talk next month on a rather technical subject. The technical material might be economic or social statistics, or it might be data on physical or chemical properties of some material, or possibly the structure of something from a molecule to a skyscraper. Whatever it is, you have decided that you can convey such data more successfully by a combined appeal to eye and ear than by the spoken word alone. You have outlined your talk, and you have made marginal notes indicating tentatively what slides you think you will need.

As you expand your outline into final form—either notes for extempore speech or a formal paper written out in full—you assign a title and number to each slide. You find that a few more slides are needed in one spot, but—if you are wise—you may also find several slides that don't quite carry their weight. You see that they are excursions into non-essential detail; so you cut them out.

1 *Engineering and Scientific Charts for Lantern Slides*, American Society of Mechanical Engineers (New York, 1932). Approved by American Standards Association, November, 1932, and listed as ASA Recommended Practice Z15.1-1932. Includes short bibliography on graphic presentation of data up to 1932.

R. C. Jordan and M. J. Edwards, *Aids to Technical Writing*, Bulletin No. 21, University of Minnesota Engineering Experiment Station (Minneapolis, 1944) 106-11.

L. S. Bonnell, Preparation of Effective Lantern Slides, *Chemical and Engineering News*, September 12, 1949.

You check your speech to see that each slide will have at least half a minute on the screen. If you feel that perhaps there are too many slides for the time at your disposal, you ruthlessly cut the number down. You also ponder any situation that calls for keeping one slide on the screen more than three or four minutes.

3

Now you are ready to design slide No. 1. That's where Dr. Brown fell down. To avoid similar mishaps, you are going to work out the design of each slide, together with your oral comments on it, as a study in the psychology of communication.

Data can be presented in many forms. You can use tables, as Dr. Brown did, or you can use graphic devices. Graphs are preferred when the data permit; i.e., when they show systematic trends, patterns, or comparisons. Also, graphic presentation is obviously applicable where the information is concrete and picturable, like the shape of a molecule, the crystalline structure of an alloy, the shape of a bacillus, or the appearance and dimensions of a mechanical part. If, like Dr. Brown, you were speaking on industrial health and safety, you might use the data in his first slide, but you would put most or all of it in graphic form instead of in numbers—and you would use three or four slides instead of one.

Before you start to make the graph for your slide No. 1, you might want to take a quick look at some of the standard works on graphic presentation of data.[2] You will find them full of fascinating detail. But if your time is limited, you may postpone that and get along with the few pointers that follow.

It's a good idea to fill the screen comfortably with the slide image. A long, narrow field, either vertical or horizontal, looks awkward on the screen and is seldom necessary. To avoid such slides, adjust your copy to fit in a space 10 units wide by 7 units high. Those figures are close to the proportions of most screens, and also of the openings in standard slide mats, both the 2x2 inch and the 3¼x4 inch size.

Make a rough pencil draft of the chart on a piece of plain paper. Begin by drawing a 10x7 inch rectangle, and then fit the data into that space with due regard for margins, legibility, and your best guess as to how the eye can be guided to see what you most want seen. Then explain the slide aloud as though to your audience. Cut out every word on the slide that isn't necessary; in most slides cut out the title, since that is covered by the spoken context. The audience can read only 10 to 20 words without losing the speaker's thread of thought.

How big should the lettering be? On your 10x7 inch original, never use any lettering less than 1/8 inch high; 3/16 inch is better. If your draftsman uses lettering guides, those numbered 140 (meaning that the letters are 0.140 inch high) should be the smallest used.

Although typing is not as clear and attractive as good hand lettering, you may sometimes be forced to type the lettering on your graphs. When that happens, select a good typewriter, clean the type thoroughly, use a well-inked black fabric ribbon (or a carbon ribbon if you can get one), and draw the graph in a smaller rectangle. Later in this article you will find suggested sizes of

[2] William C. Brinton, *Graphic Methods for Presenting Facts* (New York, 1914)
W. C. Marshall, *Graphical Methods* (New York, 1921)
Karl Karsten, *Charts and Graphs* (New York, 1923)
Herbert Arkin and R. R. Colton, *Graphs* (New York, 1936)

rectangles for both 'pica' and 'elite' machines (10 and 12 spaces per inch respectively).

Unless you make slides frequently, you probably won't bother to remember any rectangle dimensions. Here's an easier way to say it. With typical projection conditions, your audience will have trouble reading the slide if you crowd more than 75 characters and spaces into a line that runs clear across the screen; and 60 are better than 75. Allow a few spaces for margins, and you arrive at 55 or 60 spaces in a legible line of full width. From that, you can work out the rectangle size for any typewriter.

You may find, as you design the slide, that you are trying to cover several ideas in one slide. If so, divide them. Put only one central idea on each slide; additional material distracts attention. While you are talking about the first point, the audience races ahead and speculates about the others.

4

For many kinds of numerical data, you will have to decide between curves, bar charts, pictographs, pie diagrams, and other devices. In general, curves are suitable for an audience of specialists, bar charts for practically any audience, and pictographs for audiences requiring some popular touch.

If you use curves on a background of coordinates, space the coordinates rather far apart; a grid of many lines makes an unattractive slide, and rarely does an audience really need to read a curve with high accuracy. Trends rather than precise quantities are usually discussed.

The pictograph, in its usual form, is a modification of the bar chart, using a row of pictorial symbols instead of a bar. Each symbol represents a given quantity, and the pictorial quality often helps to explain the chart with a minimum of text. Though not new by any means, its real popularity in this country dates from 1930 when the Chicago Museum of Science and Industry used it on a large scale. The man who introduced the technique in Chicago has written an excellent manual on the subject.[3]

Pie diagrams are popular and they have some legitimate uses. But they are relatively hard to read with much accuracy. Bad pie diagrams are almost as common as bad restaurant pies. If you insist on cooking up a pie diagram, better read Marshall and Karsten, already referred to.[2]

If your object is to mislead, don't overlook the potentialities of the perspective diagram. You wish to exaggerate the increased tonnage of our Naval vessels without actually lying about it? Say the tonnage today is eight times what it was at a certain earlier date. In a bar chart, you simply make the second bar eight times as long as the first. It tells the truth. In an honest pictograph, you would draw one little battleship for the first year and eight for today—all the same size. That also tells the truth. If you want to exaggerate a little, you can draw two similar silhouettes of battleships, the first one inch long and the second eight inches long. Now you're beginning to mislead your audience, for the second battleship occupies 64 times as much area as the first. If you want to go all-out for exaggeration, use two battleships in perspective instead of in silhouette, still keeping the first one inch long and the second eight inches long. Now the larger drawing looks like a ship weighing 512

[3] Rudolf Modley, *How to Use Pictorial Statistics*, Harper (New York, 1936). Note: Complete discussion of the pictograph technique; one short but useful chapter on other techniques.

Ibid., Facts Told Pictorially, *New York Times*, September 15, 1935.

times as much as the first. You can juggle the figures even more by tampering with the perspective—but at this point let us draw the veil on this type of deceit. If you're an honest citizen, you'll never use a lantern slide of the type described—at least not without careful explanation.

You may have to present some material in tabular form, like Dr. Brown's first slide. But you don't have to make his errors in design. You can use briefer headings. Where two or more columns deal with similar data, you can tie them together with a general heading, and use very short subheadings for each. You can use guide lines or double spacing to help the eye to follow an item across the table. And you can limit each slide to one central idea.

The fact is, when Dr. Brown designed that slide he made at least nine errors of judgment. How would you present the same data? How many errors do you find in his design?[4]

Perhaps the commonest error, in tabular data, is to make the lettering too small. Left to her own devices, your typist may space the data so as to fill a whole page—just as she would for a typed manuscript. To avoid this, all you need to do is tell her the size of the rectangle into which the copy (with small margins on all four sides) must fit. We have already noted that a line with more than 60 to 75 spaces tends to be illegible on the screen. Combine that with our 10 to 7 screen ratio, and we arrive at these dimentions:

Elite type: a rectangle 5x3½ inches, allows space for 55 spaces per line and 18 single-spaced lines, plus a small margin all around.

Pica type: a rectangle 6x4¼ inches allows 55 spaces per line and 22 single-spaced lines, plus small margins.

These dimensions make good, legible slides. In a pinch you can make the rectangle a little larger, but not safely beyond these top limits:

With elite type, 6¼ x 4⅜ inches; this gives you 67 spaces and 23 lines plus margins.

With pica type, 7½ x 5¼ inches; now you have 67 spaces and 28 lines plus margins.

If you can't get your copy within these limits, you will do well to prescribe surgery. Cut the data down somehow. Beyond that size, copy is likely to be both illegible and unduly complex.

All those numbers sound confusing, but the essentials are easy to remember: *width*, 55 spaces; *ratio of width to height*, 10 to 7.

Whatever you do, don't hand the photographer a big printed table and ask him to copy it. See that it conforms to the limits explained above. If it doesn't, it will be disappointing as a slide. And besides, if you re-work the material you can usually improve the headings, round off the numbers, and otherwise adapt it to lantern-slide use.

5

Even after slides are well designed there are still many ways in which they can go wrong—as Dr. Brown found out. Why should the room be completely darkened for ordinary black and white

[4] Dr. Brown's errors: (1) Too many points on one slide. He presented a mass of raw data that could make at least 10 slides, of which perhaps three or four were essential to his talk. (2) Column headings too wordy. Even if we retain all the columns, the headings could be cut from 52 words to 14. (3) Columns 4 and 5 should have a group heading and subheadings; also columns 6 and 7. (4) Figures should be rounded off to show trends, not details. (5) Footnote is redundant and, after rounding-off of quantities, probably needless. (6) Title too long—seven words would do the work of 27; but better yet, why not omit it entirely? (7) Proportions of slide are bad—about 2 to 1 instead of 10 to 7. (8) Too much space between columns; slide is nearly 150 spaces wide, half of which is wasted. (9) Horizontal guide lines or spaces needed at every 3rd or 4th line. (10) Recast into graphs—bar charts preferred.

graphs and tables? In a fully darkened room 'eye contact' is lost, the audience cannot take notes, and late comers cannot find seats. Complete darkness is desirable for pictorial slides but utterly unnecessary for graphs and tables. Before the meeting, turn out the lights closest to the screen and experiment until a satisfactory balance is achieved between room lighting and screen lighting—remembering that visibility is not so good from the sides of the room as from the center.

A dozen other details will also deserve your attention—a good signal system, preferably inaudible and invisible to the audience; a pointer of the right size; placement of lectern to permit everyone to see the screen; shielding of corridor lights, exit lights, etc., if they are placed to shine on the screen; shielding of lectern light to avoid shining in eyes of audience; a lapel microphone if a public address system is necessary and you wish to be free to move around as you use the pointer. A complete check of the lantern is an often-overlooked precaution.

The growing importance of color photography suggests its utility for lantern slides, even of charts and diagrams. Business statistics showing deficits in red could be photographed and thrown on the screen in black and red. Two curves on the same chart, shown for comparison, could be quickly distinguished by separate colors. Almost every conceivable slide contains some feature which could be brought out more effectively by the use of color.

6

There are, of course, many visual aids other than lantern slides. They cannot be discussed here in detail. Sometimes a speaker must cope with motion pictures. Or he may use wall charts, maps, or blackboards. He may distribute mimeographed material to his hearers. Or he may wish to display specimens or conduct demonstrations with scientific apparatus. All such devices, in which the eye is called upon to supplement the ear, present two main psychological problems. First, a visual aid must be visible—that is, really clear and legible. Visibility depends upon lighting, scale, color, and placement. The speaker may have to take the lighting about as he finds it; but scale, color, and placement are to some extent under his control. Second, a visual aid must be so designed and used as to focus rather than scatter attention. In this department the speaker has virtually full control. He can design his material, time it, present it, with full regard to the principles of effective communication.

PERSONALITY STRUCTURE IN RELATION TO SPEECH THERAPY

Ollie Backus

MUCH of the research in the field of speech disorders has been directed to the search for historical causal explanations, that is, the attempt to relate present speech symptoms to certain facts which happened in the past. Logically it might be assumed that such knowledge is basic to the development of therapeutic procedure. Actually, however, relatively little is known yet about historical causes; relatively little can be done yet to remove them. Speech therapy has had to proceed largely on a basis of education, with whatever techniques it could employ in order to meet current demands in a rapidly expanding field. The fact that it has been able to bring about as significant changes in as many clinic patients as it has—despite inability to remove historical causes—indicates that historical causal relations do not form the only basis for the development of a body of knowledge about speech therapy.

The literature on therapy has dealt especially with construction of teaching materials, with descriptions of various discrete techniques relating to the mechanics of sound production. Yet those who engage actively in therapy—especially those who also supervise the work of student-therapists—have had a growing awareness that skill in clinical teaching involves much more than this. On non-verbal levels, at least, there has been some degree of recognition that other basic issues have relevance: that one is dealing with whole organisms rather than merely with part functions such as tongues and palates, that human beings represent processes rather than static entities, that relationships in the present have greater importance in actual clinical teaching than historical data, that speech therapists in fact have been manipulating variables in human behavior even though they have been doing it without much understanding or even consciousness of what is actually involved.

Deep concern over the current limitations in the effectiveness of speech therapy culminated in 1942 in the decision to begin a research program which would investigate the process of therapy itself. As in any new area of research, these studies have had to be qualitative rather than quantitative. The case-study method of studying behavior has been used; observations of behavior have been made within the framework of a clinical program called 'intensive group therapy.' By definition this has meant a group membership composed of persons who show various kinds of speech symptoms, a combination of both group and individual instruction daily, a program structured to provide participation in a variety of interpersonal relationships. Such a program has provided a rich source of data on the behavior of each patient. Two years ago two other techniques were added: psychiatric interviews, and projective tests: Rorschach, Bender-Gestalt, Thematic Apperception, Sentence Completion. Through such observations over these several years new relationships have been perceived, old

OLLIE BACKUS *is Associate Professor of Speech and Director of the Speech Clinic at the University of Alabama.* *This article is based on her paper presented at the ASHA Convention in Washington in December 1948.*

assumptions questioned, new hypotheses formulated.

It is the purpose of this article to indicate the direction of thinking in patterning these data: first, in questioning certain traditional basic assumptions which have influenced therapeutic procedure, and second, in contributing to the development of a theoretical structure in speech therapy both for clinical practice and for further research.

1. As a first step in planning, prior even to the first experimental session, it was necessary to examine consciously our goals in therapy. Workers in the field would agree undoubtedly that our ultimate goal can be expressed in some such way as this: to help a patient attain relative adequacy in use of speech under the stresses and strains of everyday living. This seems so self-evident perhaps as not to merit scrutiny. It assumed importance, however, when customary procedures in therapy were viewed critically. Emphasis had been placed, for the most part, upon the mechanics of sound production, with the implied assumption that ability to produce sound patterns in a laboratory situation is equivalent to ability to use them in speaking events outside the laboratory. Any therapist knows that such equivalence does not exist in fact, even though some patients have been able somehow to achieve transfer of training without clinical help. Hence that assumption had to be modified at the outset. With relative adequacy in use of speech as the ultimate goal, it seemed imperative to develop a clinical program in which therapeutic procedures would be oriented right from the start to *use* of *speech* in interpersonal relationships, rather than merely to drill on sound production. Without denying the importance of the latter in speech therapy, it was conceived of as a part-function, which should be handled in a clinical program only in relation to a whole, that is, use of speech in a real speaking event.

2. Only after several years of experimentation was a second basic assumption consciously rejected: viz., that each different type of speech disorder requires a basically different type of therapeutic procedure. This assumption has stemmed undoubtedly from the traditional practice of classifying patients according to one similarity, viz., speech symptom, with the implication that between classes there is difference, that within a given class there is sameness. The observations even in the first experimental session created doubts about such a 'class' concept.

For example, all patients, regardless of type of speech disorder, showed signs of disorganization in the speech process under situations involving social pressure. The literature on stuttering had pointed out the existence of this phenomenon, but with the implication that it was associated only with the stuttering syndrome. Observation of a group of patients, non-segregated as to type of speech disorder, showed that such disorganization occurred not only in those who showed stuttering but also in those born with cleft palate, having hearing loss, cerebral palsy, aphasia, voice disorders, articulatory distortions, etc. The perception of this one similarity which cut across class boundaries constituted the first step in undermining belief in the reality of those boundaries.

Differences within classes were observed also, not only in speech symptoms but more especially in regard to dynamic patterns of behavior which affected the patient's ability to learn. For example, in certain respects critical for therapy, an individual with cleft palate often bore more similarity to one with stuttering symptoms than he did to another

with cleft palate. Granted that for some purposes a comparison of patients on the basis of similarity of speech symptoms has convenience and value; yet in therapy where one must necessarily deal with whole functioning organisms, any classification which implies similarity of the whole because of similarity of one part represents an erroneous assumption. Certainly the recent data on psychiatric interviews and projective tests confirm such a point of view.

While every individual differs of course from all others in particular patterning of behavior, nevertheless all patients showed similarities in the areas in which behavior needed to be changed: (a) modifying perceptions, evaluations, adjustive techniques in interpersonal relationships; (b) learning 'normal' patterns of sound production; (c) increasing social skills, etc. It was therefore assumed that there exist basic techniques of therapy for all patients. These would then be modified or supplemented by special techniques within the larger framework as individual needs required. Such an assumption seems to represent the situation more adequately than the old one which is based on the idea of a different system of reference for each different type of disorder.

3. A third basic assumption was recognized and eventually rejected: viz., that all speech symptoms which one observes on a given date stem from an historically assigned cause. Such an assumption is implicit, for instance, when the labels 'functional' or 'structural' are applied diagnostically. Let us consider two so-called 'structural' disorders. It was observed, for example, that a patient with central nervous system involvement showed marked decrease in tremors as she gained greater sense of security in interpersonal relationships; yet,, of course, the lesion itself still remained. Therefore, the behavior observed during the initial interview could not be explained solely in terms of a brain injury which had occurred seven years before. Her behavior was also influenced by her perceptions of herself in relation to that particular interpersonal relationship. These perceptions, it was discovered later, had been colored by conflicts induced by cultural factors: rejection at home, fears of persons whom she perceived as 'authority figures,' etc.—such conflicts existing before as well as following the brain injury. Again, it was observed that persons born with cleft palate showed fluctuation in amount of 'nasality' as they participated in interpersonal relationships which had for them varying degrees of social pressure. While this pattern of functioning on the part of certain specific muscle groups is certainly related to the historical cause called cleft palate; nevertheless, it must be understood that function governed by one part operating as a system (in this case, muscles of the palate) is in turn influenced by the larger systems to which that part belongs (i.e., the whole organism—in environment). Hence an individual may use certain palatal function on one occasion, but quite different palatal function on another occasion because of modifications in the organization of the whole organism.

It must be recognized, then, that what one observes, even in a young child, in a given situation at a particular time represents not a simple effect produced by a force exerted by an 'original cause' but rather effects produced by a *resultant of forces* operating in *each present field* (resultant meaning 'product' not 'sum'). The concepts 'functional' and 'structural' then have but limited relevance for therapy. The concept of causes-in-the-present, or a-historical analysis, as it has been termed by Lewin, has a great deal

of relevance for therapy.[1] The assumption of multi-valued rather than single-valued causality offers better explanation for variability in behavior, helps to chart more specifically the changes that need to be made in behavior, opens up more possibilities for effecting such changes even though the historical cause cannot be removed.

4. Continued critical analysis of the growing wealth of clinical data finally made it imperative to reject the tacit assumption that speech therapy involves only motor learning. It has been pointed out in the psychological literature that the concept 'learning' refers to several different processes rather than to one, that these different types appear to be governed by different laws. Clinical practice in speech has largely been concerned with repetition and drill as it relates to the acquisition of motor skill, with little attention to the sort of learning involved in problem solving behavior, the development of insight, or as Lewin has termed it, change in cognitive structure.[2] By the latter he means particularly those situations in which a person must change basic premises, perceptions, etc., then following such reorganization, changes in behavior occur as a sudden shift.

This kind of learning is involved especially as patients learn to handle social pressures in various speaking events. For example, a teen-age girl with symptoms of childhood aphasia had been acquiring greater social skills but still did not initiate conversation. Then, at one of the parties she was asked to demonstrate some sleight-of-hand; her dexterity, together with her more fluent use of speech in the performance, won enthusiastic applause. She not only showed very different behavior that evening but next day she initiated conversation with several different people. For example, again, one boy had little awareness of the relationship between his evaluations of interpersonal relationships and disorganization in his speech. After a clinic social event he reported that he had talked fluently with one of the male guests until he found out that the man 'was a dean'; then he had had a great many stuttering spasms. Before that experience he had been oriented almost solely to the idea that he must practice on 'speech drills'; following the experience he was able to attack the problem of changing his perceptions of persons he had labelled as authority figures.

Change in cognitive structure bears an important relationship also to aspects of speech which *are* directly related to motor learning. A girl with articulatory distortions, for instance, could not even make an attempt to produce 'r' sounds in individual instruction without becoming tearful. When she recognized that her behavior stemmed from the judgment 'I can't' in her thinking she was able—directly afterward—to work productively on 'r' sounds, and did not cry again. A boy with post-operative cleft palate worked for several weeks on 's' sounds without satisfactory progress on the motor-learning aspect. Finally, after one critical episode, in which he achieved considerable reorganization in his understanding of his problem of anger, he was able that very day to produce 's' sounds within normal range, and within a few days was using them with ever increasing consistency in speech.

While skilled clinicians have in fact been helping patients to effect changes in cognitive structure, and while the importance of this process has been recognized here and there in the literature—chiefly in respect to stuttering—it has not

[1] Kurt Lewin, Behavior and Development as a Function of the Total Situation, *Manual of Child Psychology* edited by Leonard Carmichael (New York, 1941) 791-844.

[2] Ibid. 793.

been consciously recognized that change in cognitive structure as a kind of learning must constitute an important part of the body of knowledge of speech therapy generally. Such recognition would not only contribute to the education of student-therapists but also suggests challenging possibilities for further research. The more that is known about the structure of the teaching situation—which must be viewed in itself as an interpersonal relationship—the more clinical teaching can become a science rather than remain dependent upon the art of those who practice it intuitively.

5. At this point the relationship existing between speech and personality must be faced squarely. For some time workers in the field have recognized the existence of some sort of relationship. The questions traditionally asked, however, have been largely of one type: Is this speech disorder caused (or not caused) by a personality problem? Does a given individual have (or have not) a personality problem as well as a speech disorder? In such questions, predicating an 'either-or' type of answer, one is assuming the existence of two classes or dichotomies, with a boundary between the two; one is assuming that patients should be assigned a position in relation to that boundary according to some standard of value held by the examiner: that some will be judged as having 'personality problems,' whereas others will be judged as not having them.

Let us consider briefly some of the consequences which follow from the use of these valuative concepts. Such judgments about a patient are made less in terms of the dynamcs of the person himself than in terms of the examiner's 'feelings about his behavior'—frequently more in terms in 'nuisance value' in class or clinic. Those who have been judged to have 'personality problems' may be referred for testing and perhaps for counselling simply on the basis of that judgment. Those who have not been so judged are usually not examined further, despite the fact that they may have difficulties of great seriousness; then when some of these do not learn readily or do not carry over into actual use the new speech habits they may have learned to produce, clinicians feel frustrated, postulate 'lack of cooperation' as an explanation, or consider the speech disorder 'incurable.'

The old idea that 'normal' and 'abnormal' behavior represent two different classes governed by different laws, is rapidly being discarded in the fields of psychiatry and psychology. Differences in behavior are being conceived of in terms of gradations rather than dichotomies; evaluations are being made in terms of consequences to the individual rather than in terms of standard of value held by the examiner. Sullivan made this clear, for example, when he described the field of psychiatry as 'the field of interpersonal relations' rather than the field of behavior 'pathologies,' when he said of personality that it represents 'a hypothetical entity postulated to account for the doings of people one with another; that it is made manifest in interpersonal situations, and not otherwise.'[3]

The field of speech also is concerned with interpersonal relations; its particular specialty being the speaking aspect of those relationships. Changes in speech behavior may be brought about through speech education, speech therapy, psychotherapy—each alone or in combination, depending upon the needs of the individual. It should be recognized first of all that no dichotomy exists really

[3] Harry Stack Sullivan, *Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry* (The William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, Washington, D.C., 1947) 5.

between normal—disordered speech; then that no dichotomy should exist between speech education—speech therapy, or between speech therapy—psychotherapy. Each has an area in which it can contribute uniquely, but each shares with the others a common field of cooperative endeavor, provided of course they are rooted in a common base, at least as well as science at any given date has been able to structure it.

So instead of the older type of questions asked only in respect to some patients: does he have a speech disorder (or not)?, does he have a personality problem (or not)?, the questions should be asked rather, in respect to every patient: what sort of speech behavior are we dealing with?, what sort of personality structure are we dealing with?, or perhaps better, as Sullivan has suggested, what goes on in the interpersonal relationships this individual has with others? In asking such questions the assumption is made that every human being has a range of needs, drives, perceptions, adjustive techniques, etc. which operate in a particular environment at a particular time to account for overt behavior. In order to change behavior it is necessary to study not only the surface manifestations but also the deeper lying dynamic patterns (called by Lewin phenotypical levels and genotypical levels, respectively).[4]

It seems evident that the traditional classes, e.g., 'stuttering,' 'cleft palate,' 'articulation,' etc. have proved too limited as basic systems of reference for the development of therapeutic procedure. If the most basic—or broadest—system of reference is conceived of as dynamics of human behavior, if by a process of progressive differentiation the system of reference is restricted to dynamics of speech behavior, and only *then* to particular syndromes, the limiting effects of analysis of part-functions-in-isolation can be avoided.

At this date the ability to structure the whole is necessarily limited. But if perceiving it as a whole— no matter how vaguely—enables speech therapists to proceed with greater effectiveness in daily clinical practice, if it opens up new avenues for investigation, more especially if it aids research workers to proceed more quickly to controlled experimentation, it will have served a useful purpose.

[4] Kurt Lewin, *Dynamic Theory of Personality* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1935) 11.

THE SYRACUSE FILM EXPERIMENTS

R. William Stanmyre

IN the fall of 1945, the War Training Service had completed its work on the Syracuse University campus. It had completed, too, a convincing demonstration of the effective use of sound motion pictures in various fields of teaching. A conviction grew in the minds of many instructors that a potent teaching device had been much neglected, and the speech department in particular set out to investigate the potentialities of the Soundfilm, which is here defined as a composite sound and motion-picture record of a single performance.

1

The idea of filming students of public speaking in regular classroom assignments has already suggested itself to many teachers of speech. That it has not been done is probably due largely to the fact that commercial sound recording on film is inherently expensive and suitable equipment is not readily available. Yet nowhere in the college curriculum is there a subject to which the soundfilm is so logically pertinent: here is a device which mirrors the student's entire personality in a public speaking situation. More than that, it spotlights and magnifies his peculiarly personal characteristics to the exclusion of those extraneous factors which are inevitably present in the classroom.

2

It is not the purpose of this report to elaborate on matters which are purely technical, but it should be understood that standard techniques of sound picture production are too expensive for the making of individual student films. Commercial procedure involves the use of at least three separate strips of film: a sound original, a picture original, and a composite print. This is explained by the fact that a type of film suitable for sound recording is totally unsuitable for a picture original and vice versa. Financial considerations dictate that the only process which could possibly be practical for the purpose is that known as 'single-system' in which the picture and sound are recorded simultaneously on a single film. This film is developed by the reversal process and is then ready for projection. However, 'single-system' is frowned upon commercially because of the inability of reversible film stocks to do a good job of sound recording. Only three cameras have been manufactured in this country for the production of 16 mm single-system soundfilms, and two of these were discontinued by their sponsors because of the discouraging results obtained in the field. The other instrument is of excellent design but is intended for light service and holds only enough film for 5½ minutes of filming. All of these cameras were tried in the first experiments, but all pointed to the need for a distinct new type of camera if ever the project should be extended to include large numbers of students.

3

The first experiments at Syracuse were conducted during the 1945-46 school year. Three groups of students were selected from several different sections and

R. WILLIAM STANMYRE *is a producer of documentary and commercial motion pictures and a technical consultant for the Speech and Hearing Center at Syracuse University.* *The experiments here described were begun under the supervision of Professor Harry J. Heltman and with the cooperation of Cyril F. Hager and Agnes I. Allardyce of the School of Speech and Dramatic Art.*

equated by standard procedures. The first group was taught in the established manner, the second with the aid of disc recordings, and the third group was filmed three times during the semester. The first was intended to be the control group for evaluating the effectiveness of the technical aids on the other two. The work was performed in the regular classroom and each 'film' student was allotted 100 feet of 16 mm film for each of three speeches. These speeches were given at the beginning, the middle, and the end of the semester.

At the conclusion of this first modest effort, the students involved in the experiment generally agreed that no technical aid in their learning experience had been so intensely effective. Instructors generally noted that the soundfilm was unequalled in their experience as a student motivating device. During both the filming and the playbacks, an air of earnest application was evident in all the classes; absences and tardiness reached an all-time low.

But several operational difficulties had developed. Most serious was the practice of filming some students within the class and not filming others. The effect of this stratification was to introduce unnatural behavior at each level. Equally perplexing were two whole families of difficulties—one associated with the substandard character of the single-system process and equipment, and the other stemming from false behavior patterns resulting from the awesome presence of microphone, lights, and camera.

Several instructors assisted in these early experiments and their handling of the class situation fell into two categories: some encouraged a spirit of levity on the theory that it might ease the tension for those who were now to face the sound-camera for the first time. Others started each class session by solemnly admonishing the students to completely disregard the presence of technical paraphernalia. Neither appears to have been the proper approach.

No amount of reasoning could induce the average student to act entirely natural in the face of bright lighting and the presence of the microphone, camera, and operators. The lesson was plain: every effort should be made to conceal the trappings of a movie studio and to restore the normal classroom atmosphere.

4

The following year, operations were moved into a new prefab which had been erected as a part of the post-war expansion program. The building was modified so that all technical operations were performed in a small elevated control room overlooking the classrooms. The camera, projector, amplifiers, and technical personnel were now concealed though no effort was made to deny their presence. A timer on the wall was electrically interlocked with the camera to keep the instructor informed as to the readiness of the operator and the progress of the film through the camera. Lighting was reduced in intensity, faster raw stock was employed, and efforts were made to find processing facilities more suitable to the single-system technique.

The project was integrated with the course known as 'Speech 3B, Essentials of Public Speaking.' All students in all sections were filmed, but only once. Each student had bought a textbook in 3A; this semester he was not required to buy a book but instead was asked to pay $2.50 for his film. The balance was absorbed within the general University costs of instruction.

On the day when the films were first shown in class, each student was given a form on which to report his immediate

reactions. These forms were headed as follows:

Name of instructor .....
Section .....

MOTION PICTURE PROJECT REPORT

The success of this project (on the use of the motion picture in teaching and learning public speaking) depends on your cooperation today. Would you, therefore, write us an account of your immediate impressions, feelings, and reactions (pleasant or unpleasant), to seeing and hearing yourself speaking before an audience? Say anything you honestly felt or thought in this unsigned report, and try to let us know *whether or not you really think it was an advantage to you to have had yourself filmed.*

5

The year 1947-48 found the project well established, but many minor technical problems were yet to be solved. The general illumination level of the classroom was raised and the intensity in the photographing area reduced. This minimized the sensation of being 'in the spotlight' and students no longer complained about facing the lights, but it placed even more serious demands on the technical processes.

Many complaints had been noted during the first two years regarding variations in sound and picture quality. Students are likely to be conditioned by the quality standards of the commercial motion picture theatre. Even at its best, our medium cannot reproduce a frequency band as wide as a good disc recording nor can it be as free of distortion. In an effort to resolve these difficulties, a small processing machine was obtained and optimum developing procedures were determined empirically. The results indictated that the key to satisfactory quality is precise and relentless control at this point. Specifically, the best that can be expected at the present state of the art is a sound recording characteristic reasonably flat to 4500 cycles with a variation between rolls of about 5db and total harmonic distortion approximating 10%.

A special camera was synthesized from elements of standard 16mm and 35mm motion picture machinery. It featured a larger magazine capable of holding enough raw stock to film the entire class period without reloading. It was discovered, however, that in order to make use of this feature it would be necessary to order film from the manufacturer far in advance of requirements.

New amplifier equipment was bult to satisfy the convenience of a single operator for both sound and camera. It included an automatic 'peak limiter' and also a special circuit to provide an audible signal in the earphones at the 100% modulation level.

6

Any effort at more than a cursory appraisal of the value of the soundfilm as a teaching tool had been held in abeyance pending a complete victory over the technical problems. During the 1948-49 school year, only minor technical refinements were undertaken. In the spring semester, three hundred students were filmed in less than four days. Operations were now running smoothly. Student reports totalled 870 for the last three years. These have been analyzed in an effort to establish definite hypotheses for future controlled studies:

1. The overwhelming majority of the students responded favorably to the project. 91% said they felt it was to their advantage to have been filmed. 1½% said they did not feel it was to their advantage.
2. 82% of the students expressed varying degrees of surprise at seeing themselves on the screen. Of these, 43 individuals indicated that they were definitely pleased with what they saw and heard, but the great majority expressed themselves in such a way that it could not be determined whether the surprise was pleasant or unpleasant. The most-used expressions were 'surprised,' 'amazed,' 'shocked,' 'revealing,' and 'is that I?' There is obviously a severe discrepancy between what the student expects to see and what the soundfilm presents to him.

3. 46% volunteered a statement in one form or another that the soundfilm had made them clearly appreciate the existence of faults in appearance or speech which the instructor had tried unsuccessfully to convey. The teaching staff was keenly aware of this attitude and openly welcomed any plan which might make the use of soundfilms consistently available.
4. 26% mentioned specific faults and expressed their intention to correct them. Since the reports were written at the conclusion of each class period, it seems reasonable to assume that the films made rather a lasting impression.
5. Six students suggested that some of their professors might benefit from being filmed.
6. On a private showing of thirty-five films, the department chairman was able to name correctly the instructor of twelve of the students. This is strong evidence that there is a definite conditioning of the student's incremental speech behavior by the instructor's own speech pattern.
7. All instructors associated with the project agreed that the students did as well or better than when they were not being filmed, (except for the first year). Five of the ten instructors individually observed that many students in periods immediately following the project were 'more humble' and 'more attentive' to the instructor's suggestions for improvement. All agreed that the students were very quiet and attentive during the showings, and that many seemed very thoughtful or puzzled when the showings were over.

Recommendations for Further Study

Conditions are presented far more favorable than they were at the time this experiment was started. Raw film is now readily obtainable in any quantity. Heavy duty cameras currently being manufactured for photographing from the television picture tube have been successfully modified to permit single-system sound recording. Automatic film processing machines have reached a high state of perfection. Some universities already own such machines It is suggested, therefore, that further investigations be conducted along the following lines:

1. Controlled studies should be planned to place a coefficient of worth on the use of the soundfilm in teaching public speaking.
2. Controlled studies should be planned to determine the best method of utilizing the soundfilm in teaching public speaking
3. It appears that the soundfilm has the net effect of exaggerating or spotlighting those elements of overt speech behavior which differ from the conventional. A knowledge of the exact reasons for this apparent exaggeration should prove valuable.
4. Once established as a method for teaching public speaking, the groundwork would be complete for extending the use of the soundfilm to the fields of Salesmanship, Television, Teaching, Preaching, and others.

CAN THE COLLEGES USE LOW POWER FM?

Herold T. Ross

MANY college administrators and departments of speech and radio are watching with unusual interest the establishment of the first low power, non-commercial, educational FM radio stations authorized under the new rules approved by the Federal Communications Commission last year. They are asking questions such as these:

1. Is the low power station a practical medium for educational broadcasting?

2. Can such a station be constructed and maintained within the budget limitations of the average college?

3. Is this new type of station the answer to many of the problems of teaching radio at the college level?

4. What is the procedure for installing such a station?

The answer to the first question is evidently in the affirmative according to the FCC, after a long study of FM for educational broadcasting. Almost from the beginning of frequency modulation, the commission set aside channels for schools and colleges and urged their use. Many institutions responded by investigating the possibilities, but only five established and consistently maintained stations in operation.[1] The others compiled estimates of construction ranging from $25,000 to $50,000 with equally high maintenance costs which were considered too costly. The result was that programs for educational broadcasting were abandoned, and radio instruction and activity, expanding with ever increasing rapidity, were forced to use outlets over commercial stations or through campus-built transmitters and carrier-current systems.

In April 1947, the General Electric Company and Syracuse University secured a permit to experiment with a 2½ watt FM transmitter. Early in 1948 DePauw University applied for such a low power station. On June 17, the FCC announced proposed changes in the regulations authorizing low power educational stations using transmitters of ten watts or under. The new rules were adopted on August 18, 1948. Syracuse was granted the first permit for its 2½ watt station and shortly thereafter DePauw received a permit for a 10 watt station. Speaking of the Syracuse station, Mr. Wayne Coy, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, said:

> The Commission believes that this low-power type of station will not only make possible a highly desirable service in hundreds of school systems over the country but will provide a significant impetus toward the establishment of the full power non-commercial education FM stations.[2]

The answer to the second question, that of constructing and maintaining such a station, is likewise favorable. The cost of a 10 watt transmitter with a single bay antenna and coaxial cable ranges from $1500 to $2500. The minimum studio equipment can be purchased for around $2000. In many instances campus studios, consoles, pre-amplifiers, microphones, and turntables can be used without an outlay for new equipment. The total cost of a new station com-

HEROLD T. ROSS *is Head of the Department of Speech and Director of Radio Station WGRE at DePauw University.*

[1] Judith Waller, *Radio, the Fifth Estate* (Boston) 1946.

[2] Wayne Coy, Address, Indiana University, 29 July 1948.

pletely equipped can be placed between $3000 and $5000. These figures will provide adequately for station operation but there will need to be a careful study made of requirements, for much expensive and desirable equipment is available.

The operating budget of such a station is subject to many variables, but some of the more important and desirable items can be listed:

1. A transcription service, if it specifically meets the need of the station, is desirable. Special rates may now be secured for educational stations from transcription companies ranging from $30 to $75 a month on two or three year 12-month contracts.

2. Recordings are also necessary to supplement the transcriptions. Recording companies send new releases to commercial stations free of charge, but there is no policy in respect to the low power stations. New monthly releases may be secured from some companies for around $25. The amount budgeted will depend upon the number of recordings used weekly and the type of music required.

3. A newswire service is necessary if state or national news is to be carried on the air. These services, including maintenance of the equipment and supplies plus weekly releases, are now being offered educational institutions at figures as low as $90 a month on annual contracts which provide for suspension of service during vacation periods. Some services are much higher. A daily drop service by mail or express may be had for around $9 a week if the station is close to a news center.

4. Compensation for student engineers holding Radio licenses, Second Class, must be provided at local rates for each hour on the air.

5. Compensation for student secretaries and clerks is desirable where regular broadcasting schedules are maintained. Fifty dollars a month is an average estimate.

6. Supplies and mimeographing will cost from $150 to $250 a year.

7. Equipment replacement and maintenance should certainly include one complete set of tubes. $300 should provide for all except severe damage to vital equipment.

8. Telephone lines or loops are used by most stations for remote broadcasting. Telephone companies will install a loop for around $7.50 and then make a monthly charge of $3.50 for the first quarter mile of line and $1.25 for each additional quarter mile.

From these estimates, then, it is evident that maintenance costs may be kept to a very reasonable figure and well within the limits of the average college budget.

The answer to the third question as to whether this new type of station will solve some of the problems involved in teaching radio at the college level is again 'Yes.' A low power college station operated under a license of the FCC differs from the small commercial station only in the matter of selling time. In every other respect the station operation and programming is in the same pattern. A well conducted college staff engages in audience analysis and research, building its listener group with as much care as it would if time were sold. Program requirements must meet even higher standards than small commercial stations need to maintain. All of the studio and office routines may be carried on according to the best accepted practices. With students eager to work in minor as well as in major positions on the staff, the college station has much more help than the commercial station can afford to hire. As a re-

sult it can maintain a high standard of operation and performance. Such a station becomes the ideal laboratory and workshop for the classroom instruction in radio. Inasmuch as one of the biggest problems in teaching has been that of creating situations comparable to that of actually being on the air, the college low power station is a solution which provides all the air time needed.

Another problem in teaching has been that of providing practical as well as theoretical instruction. The criticism of station managers has often been that students were not prepared for the types of work they would need to do if hired. The recently organized University Association For Professional Radio Education has proposed a program of study and activity designed to meet this criticism. One of the provisions calls for students to have daily logged broadcasting experience. The low power college FM station offers this opportunity under actual broadcasting conditions and with every program on the air.

Students working in college stations may pass through a three or four year apprenticeship which will certainly qualify them for positions in the industry. A student who broadcasts fifteen minutes of news daily for an academic year, having his work constructively criticized, is ready for a commercial newsroom. Another student, planning and producing disc-jockey shows every evening for college and community audiences becomes 'an old hand at the business.' The same is true of directors and performers in dramatic and musical shows. In every instance, they pile up those hours on the air so essential for jobs in radio. If the standards and supervision of the station have been as high or higher than those of commercial stations, then students should be adequately prepared and ready for commercial radio.

Perhaps the third problem in teaching has been that of providing instruction which might be properly termed professional so that graduates may be accorded professional standing in the business world.[3] If the students have carried on programs of courses in radio which are recognized as on the college level of instruction and have supplemented this theory with many hours of work in the college station, organized and supervised as carefully as any science laboratory, surely they are entitled to the same professional recognition accorded a chemist or a physicist. The low power college station may be most helpful in bringing about an improved status for announcers and radio personnel.

If, in view of the foregoing, a low power, non-commercial FM college station seems desirable, the following procedure is necessary in securing a license to broadcast:

1. An application must be filed with the Federal Communications Commission in duplicate for permission to construct the station. The form to be used is No. 340, and it must be carefully and completely prepared. The technical information as to the transmitter and antenna will be furnished by the manufacturer of the equipment. If any particular call letters are desired, an application for them should be made at this time, listing several desired combinations, inasmuch as the call letters are assigned with the building permit.

2. Application should be made to Major Edwin H. Armstrong for a Broadcast Transmittal License, since he holds patents covering FM transmitting equipment.

[3] Don W. Lyon, Is Radio Announcing a Profession?, QJS 31 (1918):337.

3. After the construction permit has been granted and the installation made, a request must be made to the Regional Manager of the Field Engineering and Monitoring of the Federal Communications Commission forty-eight hours prior to equipment testing which may be carried on for 30 days.

4. When the station is ready for regular programming, the Regional Manager must again be notified forty-eight hours in advance. This activity may likewise be carried on for 30 days.

5. Finally, application must be made on form No. 310 for a broadcast station license. This is the last step in the procedure. There is no minimum daily broadcast schedule required for stations of this type. They may also cease operation during school vacations periods, provided they notify the Regional Manager.

Can the colleges use low power FM? Syracuse University has demonstrated its practicality. The DePauw station with a student staff has had a successful experience on the air. Its programs broadcast from an antenna only seventy-six feet above ground, have been clearly heard more than ten miles in all directions. Other college permits have recently been authorized along with those of a number of public school systems. Low power FM, therefore, gives promise of becoming an important factor in the educational broadcasting of the future.

A SURVEY OF DRAMATIC ACTIVITY IN WISCONSIN HIGH SCHOOLS: 1947-1948

Ronald C. Gee and John E. Dietrich

THIS survey represents a second step in the attempt to assemble a picture of dramatic activity in the non-professional theatre in America. In April of 1948 the QJS published an initial survey of dramatics in our colleges, which traced by quantitative methods the patterns and trends in campus theatrical activity.[1] The present study explores in an intensive manner the dramatic activity in the high schools of Wisconsin, a state noted for its accomplishments in the field of speech. Comparisons may be drawn between college and high-school dramatics, since the survey follows procedures in the compilation and analysis of the data which are identical with those used in the previous study.

Procedure

Early in 1949, 414 public high schools were asked to respond to a simple questionnaire concerning their dramatic activity in the academic year 1947-48. These 414 schools composed, with minor exceptions, all public high schools in the state.

A total of 237 schools responded, with 211 schools reporting a dramatic program, including full-length productions. The returns showed an even distribution of schools as to size and geographic position in the state. It may be assumed that, had every school in the state responded, the relative amount of dramatic activity would have been less than is shown on the survey.

RONALD C. GEE and JOHN E. DIETRICH *are members of the staff of the Department of Speech at the University of Wisconsin. Mr. Gee was formerly Director of Drama at Delevan High School, Delevan, Wisconsin. He is now a Teaching Assistant in the Department of Speech. Mr. Dietrich is Associate Professor of Speech.*

[1] John E. Dietrich, Survey of Dramatic Activity in American Colleges: 1946-47. QJS 34 (1948). 183-190.

Analysis of the Data

A totaling of the data indicates that the 211 schools reporting a program produced 367 plays before a combined audience of approximately 217,000 persons. An interesting quantitative comparison may be made between the high school and the college. Assuming the samples to be equivalent, the high schools of a single state produced almost 70% as many plays before 30% as large a total audience as the colleges of the nation.

1. The Amount and Scope of Dramatic Activity

These data are reported in Table 1. The 211 schools were distributed into eight classes on the assumption that size of school would be one of the determinants of the amount of dramatic activity. Examination of Table I indicates that, at the secondary school level, this is a largely false assumption.

A decided majority of schools with enrollments of 500 or less produce either one or two shows each year. Approximately 20% of the Class A schools played three productions a year, while only two schools in the entire distribution mounted four productions.

The size of the auditorium is an important factor in determining the number of performances. Many high schools are built with large assembly halls in which the entire student body may be

TABLE 1

EXTENT AND DISTRIBUTION OF DRAMATIC ACTIVITY IN 228 WISCONSIN HIGH SCHOOLS 1947-1948

Class	Size of Schools[1]	Number of Schools	Average Number of Productions	Average Number of Performances	Average Attendance	Average Cost per Production	Average Net Profit
A	500—over	17	2.02	1.86	567[2]	$203	$201
B	300—500	24	1.54	1.35	381[2]	102	126
C	225—300	27	1.70	1.15	370[2]	64	139
D	175—225	23	1.65	1.29	266	53	105
E	125—175	29	1.65	1.42	245	39	89
F	100—125	20	1.50	1.03	203	31	72
G	75—100	22	1.86	1.05	209	27	75
H	1— 75	19	1.68	1.25	199	33	78
Grand Total or Average		211	1.74	1.39	305	$ 93	$132

[1] Enrollment figures as reported in *Wisconsin Official School Directory 1947-1948*, State Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin.

[2] In Classes A, B, and C, the average attendance figures have been corrected to exclude those cases distinctly atypical (eg. one Class A school had an attendance of 4,500 for a single production).

convened at one time. Such an auditorium sharply reduces the need for numerous performances. The range in performance is from one to five with the five performance schedules largely limited to the large schools with small auditoriums. The performance averages reported in Table 1 show that, with the exception of the Class A schools, one or two performances is the rule. At the opposite extreme, two Class H schools with enrollments of 75 or less performed their plays three times. In each of these cases, the theatre was a class room.

Great variation is found in the size of the audiences. Table 1 illustrates the almost perfect correlation between attendance at the plays and enrollment in the school. The audiences ranged in size from 75 to 4500. In general, the largest audiences are drawn by musicals, variety shows, and pageants. However, the range in average audience size is not very great. While the largest schools average 567 persons per production, the smallest schools are able to average almost 200.

A hypothetical program employing averages shows that the high schools of the state play 1.74 productions per year. Each production is performed 1.39 times before a total audience of 305. These figures hold up remarkably well with those of the average college. The average college mounts 3.36 productions, performed 2.55 times before a total audience of 1300.

2. Student Participation in Dramatics

The high-school drama program touches the lives of a great many students. There were 12,056 students who actively participated in dramatic activity. Using the total high-school enrollment figure of the State Department of Public Instruction, we find that one in every ten Wisconsin high-school students joined in the preparation of a full-length dramatic production as a member of the cast, the crew, or the production staff. Even more significant is the report from some of the small schools that practically every member of the student body had a part in the dramatic program.

3. Costs and Profits

Data on costs and profits are reported in Table 1. Production expenses, which usually include little or no overhead, indicate that some $30,000 was expended

during the year by the schools who reported on the survey. The average cost for all productions was $93.00. The average cost for the production of plays was $80.00, while the average cost of musicals, variety shows, and pageants was $267.00. This differential is explained by the extra expenses incurred in the production of a musical. Schools with enrollments of less than 300 (Classes C through F) spend very little on their productions. The extremely low cost figures clearly indicate the difficulties in production which confront the high-school director.

A comparison of high-school and college expenditures makes the picture more vivid. The annual dramatic production budget of the University of Wisconsin is almost the equivalent of the combined total budgets for all of the high schools in the state.

If the expenditures for play production in the high schools seem discouraging, real astonishment should greet examination of the profit side of the ledger which is reported in Table 1. The high schools are realizing profits which are one to three times the amount expended on the production. In Class A schools, profits are, on the average, equal to expenditures. In the smaller schools, profits range from 100% to 200%, e.g., in Class G schools, disbursements averaged $27.00 per production while profits averaged $75.00 per production.

Figures such as the above lead to the conclusion that the profit motive is one of the driving forces in high-school dramatics. This assumption is corroborated by an analysis of the sponsoring organizations. Approximately 75% of the plays are put on under the auspices of junior and senior classes. Schools following this procedure report that profits from the plays usually are used for graduation exercises, proms, class picnics, and similar functions. In fact, some schools report that the play profits are used for such non-dramatic endeavors as athletic equipment and tree planting. Only 10% of the high-school productions are sponsored by drama or allied groups whose primary interest is presumably in the play rather than the profit. This situation accounts, at least in part, for the relatively small proportion of the net proceeds which are turned into the purchase of better stage equipment or the development of a more effective drama program.

4. Types of Dramatic Material

The high-school productions were divided into four classes of dramatic material. These classifications were drama, comedy, mystery, and musical. As in the college study, a drama was defined as any play with a serious message handled in a predominantly serious manner. A play was considered comedy if its fundamental aim was laughter and entertainment. The mystery and comedy-mystery were grouped together. The term 'musical' included operettas, variety shows, and home-talent reviews. The original play classification was discarded since the high schools are producing little which can be considered original, other than home-talent reviews.

Analysis of this data shows that the comedy (usually farce-comedy) is the overwhelming favorite of the high schools. More than 78% of all productions were comedy. The second choice is the mystery (usually comedy-mystery) with 12% of the productions falling in this category. Musicals accounted for 7% of the production schedule. Productions of musicals are rather evenly divided between operettas and home-talent reviews, with a few variety shows. At the bottom of the list is the serious drama. Less than 3% of all the high-school

productions were serious in nature. In the selection of dramatic material, the size of the school appears to be a significant factor. Approximately 14% of the plays produced by Class A schools could be classified as drama. At the opposite extreme, not a single school in five of the seven enrollment classifications produced a serious play.

5. Sources of Dramatic Material

In the college survey, Samuel French, Inc. and Dramatists Play Service were found to control 72% of the plays. A different situation exists at the secondary level. More than 64% of the plays used by Wisconsin high schools came from small publishing companies in the Midwest, which cater to the high-school trade. Since a great majority of the play titles are unfamiliar to the college drama teacher, it may be assumed that high-school play selection often consists of thumbing through the catalogues found in the high-school office.

6. Analysis of Play and Authors

Even a cursory examination of the list of high-school plays shows a startling contrast between secondary school and college dramatic fare. Application of the yardstick of classical and contemporary Broadway drama sharply defines the activities of the high school. The majority of the high schools produce neither. A special type of cheap-to-produce, easy-to-play slapstick farce and maudlin melodrama is being written for the high-school market.

Of the 367 productions, only three were classical scripts. Shakespeare is represented on this list by 'Macbeth.' None of his comedies was done. The second classical play was George Bernard Shaw's 'Arms and the Man.' The final classical choice was Molière's 'The Imaginary Invalid.' If this classification is broadened to include all European drama, only two plays are added to the list —Ferenc Molnar's 'The Swan' and J. M. Barrie's 'The Little Minister.'

The high schools of Wisconsin produced 53 plays which had their initial success on Broadway. Many of these plays are representative of Broadway at its comic best. In order of popularity, the first nine are: 'Dear Ruth,' 'Our Town,' 'Arsenic and Old Lace,' 'You Can't Take It With You,' 'Best Foot Forward,' 'The Night of January 16th,' 'George Washington Slept Here,' 'The Man Who Came to Dinner,' and 'Years Ago.' In addition, the high schools produced four standard operettas. These were: 'Waltz Dream,' 'Captain of the Guard,' 'Mikado,' and 'The Red Mill.'

The other 311 productions were plays which appear to have been written especially for the high school. This group may be divided into two classes: 1. those which have some perceivable literary or theatrical base, and 2. those which don't. There were ten productions of plays which seemed to belong in the first classification. Many of these are adaptations of some other literary form, e.g., Both Tarkington's 'Clarence,' and Louisa M. Alcott's 'Little Women.'

The final classification includes plays of extremely doubtful worth. The authors of the study set out to read at least the synopses of these plays and gave up in despair. While titles are not a valid criterion of play content, the following will at least suggest the type of material involved: 'The Daffy Dills'; 'Aunt Bessie Beats the Band'; 'Fixit, Incorporated'; 'Gangway for Ghosts'; 'Atomic Blond'; 'Big Potato'; 'The Cannibal Queen'; 'Everybody's Crazy Now'; 'The Goof From Gopher Gulch'; 'Lay Down, You're Dead'; 'One Mad Night'; 'Betty Jane From Punkin Lane'; 'Yonny Yonson's Yob'; 'Romance in the Boarding House'; etc., ad nauseam.

If the results of the preceding analysis are reduced to percentages, we find that 1% of the high-school productions are classic, standard, or European; 15% are contemporary Broadway drama; 1% are standard operettas; 3% are high-school plays with observable worth; and 80% are plays of extremely doubtful merit.

These results indicate a sharp contrast between the plays studied in the classroom and those produced on the stage. While the state curriculum is vague as to the amount and kind of dramatic literature to be taught, almost every high school in the state teaches some Shakespeare. Many of the larger schools expand their literature courses to include the best of the modern as well as classic drama. It is unfortunate that more than three-quarters of the productions (which take from four to seven weeks of the students' time) do not approach the standards which are expected of students in the curriculum.

7. Problems in Play Selection

The difficulties which confront the high-school director in the choice of a script were studied. The following analysis may not be entirely valid, in that limited space on the questionnaire discouraged free response, and the checklist may not have included all of the significant problems. The items surveyed were: 1. limited stage facilities, 2. cast too large or too small, 3. objectionable script materials, 4. high cost of production, 5. lack of audience interest, 6. lack of student interest.

Limited stage facilities takes first place among this group of play-selection problems. Problems of casting are considered a significant barrier to effective play selection by many directors. Surprisingly enough, objectionable script material does not seem to seriously concern most high school directors. High cost of production was considered an important factor by 50% of the directors. Student and audience interest were not considered problems.

8. Auditoriums and Equipment

The survey analyzed in some detail the physical equipment of the high schools. The majority of the high schools do have a stage of sorts available. However, almost 50% of the high-school stages are built in one end of a gymnasium, with the attendant acoustical problems and reservation conflicts.

Over 50% of the schools have a cyclorama and some flats. Just under 60% have some mobile lighting equipment such as strip lights, spot lights, and flood lights. Slightly more than 40% of the schools judged their light control (switchboards and dimmers) to be adequate. Very few schools, 12%, have a workshop for building scenery. Less than 20% maintain either a costume wardrobe or a backlog of properties.

Conclusions

The high school dramatics program in the state of Wisconsin holds an important place in the life of the school and the community. In a single year, more than 10,000 students participated in the activities, and over 200,000 spectators viewed the performances. Though there are definite limitations in the facilities and equipment, the majority of the schools in the state carry on a full-length dramatic program. A quantitative evaluation of the work shows that the amount of high-school dramatic activity compares favorably with that found in the average college.

While the scope of the dramatic activity is encouraging, certain practices of the secondary schools may be viewed with some concern. The habit of choos-

ing plays with an eye to large profits should be discouraged. Too many of the productions are sponsored by groups whose prime interest is in the profit rather than the play. The great majority of the schools do not use the net proceeds for the extension and improvement of the drama program.

Perhaps the sharpest criticism to be leveled at the high-school program is in matters of play selection. The plethora of farce comedy on the high-school playbills should be reviewed. Many of the schools produce more than one play each year. At least these schools should be able to experiment with more serious dramatic fare. In addition, more than three-quarters of the productions have little perceivable dramatic or literary merit. These scripts are apparently chosen either because they are cheap-to-produce and easy-to-play or because the high-school directors have such a limited theatrical background that they are unaware of the expanse of dramatic material available.

If students are expected to spend several weeks of intensive effort in the production of a play, some correlation should be found between curricular goals and extracurricular practice. The after-school play should reflect in-school ideas and principles.

THE GENERAL SPEECH MAJOR

Donald E. Hargis

1

THE requirement for the general major is one of the problems which confronts the college teacher of speech. The general major, about which this study centers, is the broad liberal arts program in speech; it is not aimed at training in one specific phase, such as public speaking, drama, speech science, interpretation, or radio; but it requires or at least allows elections in a majority of the phases. There are few source materials of a practical nature to which the instructor can refer while trying to solve this problem. An occasional article evinces interest in it, but it is difficult to make direct application of these materials to the planning of the general speech major.

Regional surveys of courses and requirements by Smith[1], Bryan[2], and Constans and Hopkins[3] are interesting only from the local point of view. An occasional report, such as that by Sanderson[4], gives detailed information concerning the requirements in but one department. Several articles have been written based on surveys of the teaching major[5], and at least one report has been published on it by a committee appointed by the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.[6] However, the study of 356 college and university catalogues which Weaver[7] made in 1932 is the only one which attempts a detailed survey of the major requirements. He found that 135 universities and colleges offered the major in speech, with eighty having separate departments of speech. In the schools offering the major, eighteen to thirty-five hours were required in speech, with an average requirement of twenty-four hours. His article concludes with a summary of the titles of the courses offered in the various schools. While these studies are helpful, no one of them offers much specific assistance to the instructor planning the general major.

2

The following survey was made on the examination of 522 college and university catalogues for the years 1947-48 and 1948-49. The catalogue for 1948-49 was used whenever the university published one for that year. So that this would be a study of the general major as previously defined, the standards determined for the inclusion of a school in the survey were that the departmental offerings include the principal phases of speech: public address, drama, speech science, and interpretation; that the major be one which was designed to allow sampling from all of these phases; and, as far as could be determined, that the major be general in spirit and intent.

DONALD E. HARGIS *is an Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of California at Los Angeles.*

[1] Bromley Smith, Public Speaking in New England Colleges, QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION 3 (1917).57-68.

[2] E. C. Bryan, Speech Training in Texas Colleges, QJS 18 (1932).261-69.

[3] H. P. Constans and A. A. Hopkins, A Survey of Speech Work in Colleges in the South, QJS 20 (1934).402-09.

[4] Virginia Sanderson, Another Speech Department Records Progress, QJS 17 (1931).339-45.

[5] Lousene Rousseau, Speech Education in the Normal Schools—A Survey, QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION 8 (1922).209-17. Virginia Sanderson, The Speech Curriculum in Teachers Colleges, QJS 18 (1932).207-16. C. A. Fritz, Speech Courses in the Teachers Colleges, QJS 14 (1928).82-6.

[6] C. P. Lahman and committee, Speech Education in Teacher-Training Institutions, QJS 16 (1930).42-61.

[7] J. C. Weaver, A Survey of Speech Curricula, QJS 18 (1932).607-12.

It is felt that the results of the survey would be greatly distorted if schools were included which offer only one or two phases of speech. While no absolute standards could be determined for the type or number of courses in a particular phase which was considered adequate, however, when two or three courses were listed, that was deemed sufficient. If the number of hours required in one phase of speech was so great as to prevent the election of courses in other phases, then that school was excluded from the study. At the same time, although they met the requirements discussed above, six *schools* of speech were not included. Their offerings were so broad and their requirements so detailed that they reasonably could not be included for analysis with the general speech major as offered in the average college.

3

Each of the 522 catalogues examined listed a course or courses in speech, while there were 248 departments and 272 majors which could be included under that general term. Of the 272 majors, only 200 met the requirements decided upon for the study of the general major. The major was offered within departments with a variety of titles: Speech was the name of 144 of them; Speech and Drama, the title of twenty-five; Speech and Dramatic Art for sixteen; Speech Arts for two; and there were ten others with various titles. The major was included within the English department in three instances. Only nine of the departments were outside of the Letters and Arts College, in the College of Fine Arts. Three different degrees were offered for the major; 182 were the Bachelor of Arts degree, nine the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree, and nine the Bachelor of Science degree.

In order to have a consistent basis for comparison, all of the hour requirements were translated into semester hours. The range of the required hours in speech was from eighteen to sixty with a mean of 29.4. As is shown in Table 1, 70% of the schools asked either twenty-four or thirty hours in speech. From two to fifty-nine hours in specific speech courses were required in 191, or 95.5% of the majors. The range of elective hours within the hours required for the major was from one to twenty-nine; fourteen schools allowed for no electives. Considering only those schools which had required courses, the average requirement was for 31.1 hours in speech with 16.5 hours of course work specified and 14.6 hours allowed as elective. When all of the 200 departments

TABLE 1

REQUIRED HOURS FOR THE MAJOR IN SPEECH

Number of hours	Number requiring	Percent requiring
18	1	0.5
19	—	—
20	—	—
21	—	—
22	1	0.5
23	—	—
24	68	34.0
25	3	1.5
26	7	3.5
27	3	1.5
28	3	1.5
29	—	—
30	72	36.0
31	—	—
32	13	6.5
33	1	0.5
34	1	0.5
35	—	—
36	15	7.5
37	—	—
38	—	—
39	2	1.0
40	3	1.5
41	—	—
42	1	0.5
43	—	—
44	—	—
45	2	1.0
46	—	—
47	—	—
48	2	1.0
**		
60	1	0.5
Mean — 29.4	200	100.0

were considered, regardless of requirements or electives, a mean of 15.8 hours of course work in speech were specified and 13.6 hours allowed as elective.

For purposes of analysis, the tabulations of the required courses in speech were grouped into the general phases of speech—public address, including elementary public speaking, advanced public speaking, argumentation, debate, and discussion; theatre arts, including general drama, play production, acting, direction, stagecraft, and history of the theatre; speech science, including voice science, phonetics, and speech correction; interpretation; fundamentals; voice and diction; radio; and a miscellaneous group, including teaching of speech, problems and seminar, individual lessons, and speech psychology. Table 2 gives the data on the courses in public address. It shows the number of schools and the percentage of the 200 schools requiring the course, the range of the hour requirement, the mean number of hours asked in the subject by the departments requiring it, and the number of departments offering at least a single course in the field.

Elementary public speaking was a basic course, offered as the first work in in elementary nor in advanced public speaking as a part of the major. On the other hand, forty-nine departments asked for courses in both elementary and advanced public speaking. On the other schools, seventy-eight demanded a course in elementary public speaking; for advanced public speaking, forty-nine made the requirement.

The number of courses in debate, argumentation, and discussion asked for was consistently less than the number for the two public speaking classifications. While these courses were not demanded so frequently as were the ones in public speaking, still they were an important part of the requirement in public address. Only ten schools which have courses specified for the major did not require work in public address. the department, while the advanced course was given beyond the elementary level either with or without a prerequisite elementary course. Twenty-four of the schools required neither a course

TABLE 2

REQUIRED HOURS IN PUBLIC ADDRESS

Course	Number requiring	Percent requiring	Range of hours	Mean hours	Number offering
1. Elementary Public Speaking	127	63.5	1-6	3.8	189
2. Advanced Public Speaking	98	49.0	2-6	3.4	164
3. Debate	43	21.5	1-6	2.6	103
4. Argumentation	38	19.0	2-6	2.7	72
5. Discussion	24	12.0	2-4	2.6	56
Public Address	181	90.5	2-18	6.1	200

Table 3 gives an analysis of the hours in the field of theatre arts. The first classification, drama, includes general introductory lecture courses which approach the theatre from a literary viewpoint.

The most general requirement was for the course titled play production. This course covered something in all of the phases of theatre production, including play analysis, play selection, casting, acting, scene design and construction, and the staging of the play. For the play production course there was a mean requirement of 4.2 hours, which was the highest mean hour requirement

TABLE 3

REQUIRED HOURS IN THEATRE ARTS

Course	Number requiring	Percent requiring	Range of hours	Mean hours	Number offering
1. Drama	35	17.5	1-6	3.1	48
2. Play Production	70	35.0	2-12	4.2	175
3. Acting	46	23.0	1-9	2.7	129
4. Stagecraft	19	9.5	2-4	2.7	74
5. Direction	20	10.0	1-6	3.1	68
6. History of the Theatre	7	3.5	3-6	4.2	22
Theatre Arts	109	54.5	2-32	6.7	200

made for any course. There were fourteen courses in theatre arts totaling thirty-eight hours, which were required and which could not be classified with the other courses in the phase; these were in costume, make-up, playwriting, and dramatic literature. While they were not listed in Table 3, they were considered in determining the totals for the theatre arts phase.

Although a course or courses in theatre arts were required by only 54.5% of the departments, the extremely high mean for the requirement and the wide range of required hours should be noted. It is apparent that when a course in theatre arts was required, the requirement was greater than for any other phase of speech. If one course were asked for, then in 65% of the cases at least a second course also was demanded.

Data on the required hours in speech science are tabulated in Table 4. While courses in speech science have not been taught for as many years as those in the two previous classifications, yet they form a significant part of the major requirement. Over one-third of the departments, 36.5%, demanded a course in the area. In the three divisions, phonetics, voice science, and speech correction, the courses ranged from elementary work on the lower division level to offerings of the undergraduate seminar type.

All of the required hours in interpretation were grouped together as shown in Table 5. Over half, 56.5%, of the departments made a requirement in interpretation. It appeared in combination with any one or all of the other phases of speech; it never appeared alone as the only requirement. The courses ranged from those in elementary interpretation designed for freshmen to senior courses in the theory of oral interpretation.

The fundamentals course, including an introduction to all or the majority of the phases of speech, is tabulated separately in Table 5. As it deals collectively with public address, theatre arts, speech science, and interpretation, it could not be classified legitimately in any

TABLE 4

REQUIRED HOURS IN SPEECH SCIENCE

Course	Number requiring	Percent requiring	Range of hours	Mean hours	Number offering
1. Phonetics	30	15.0	1-4	2.5	89
2. Voice Science	11	5.5	1-4	2.6	53
3. Speech Correction	46	23.0	1-8	3.1	123
Speech Science	73	36.5	1-12	3.5	200

TABLE 5

REQUIRED HOURS IN INTERPRETATION, FUNDAMENTALS, AND VOICE AND DICTION

Course	Number requiring	Percent requiring	Range of hours	Mean hours	Number offering
1. Interpretation	113	56.5	1-9	3.5	200
2. Fundamentals	32	16.0	1-6	3.6	38
3. Voice and Diction	74	37.0	1-6	2.7	157

of the other divisions. Also tabulated in Table 5 are the data on the course in voice and diction. This is an elementary course in voice which cannot be grouped with the courses in speech science as it stresses personal improvement rather than a body of theory material. It was a demand which was made on the lower division level in the freshman or sophomore year. The relatively high percentage of schools, 37%, requiring the single specific course in voice and diction should be noted.

It is difficult to consider radio as a separate phase of speech. It is such a new entrant into the speech field that, as Table 6 shows, only ninty-eight of the 200 schools offered at least one course in it. However, as a growing and developing part of speech work, it is considered separately. Over 80% of the radio courses required were of a general introductory nature.

There were four courses which could not be grouped legitimately in any of the five general phases of speech which have been discussed. The most widely required of these is one in the problems of speech. In this catagory have been listed all courses labeled seminar, problems, problems in speech, and the like. The nine departments which required individual work with students on a credit basis were the only schools which offered such work for credit; twenty-two schools indicated that like work could be done on a non-credit basis. Courses in the teaching of speech and the psychology of speech were the only other courses with any regularity of demand. There were fourteen required courses, totaling thirty credit hours in such fields as parliamentary law, history of rhetoric and public speaking, logic, and aesthetics, which were listed so infrequently that they did not form catagories by themselves and which could not be grouped into any of the phases listed before.

4

It was hoped at the outset of this study that a typical pattern of requirements could be established for the speech major. However, it appears in examining the assembled data that such a project is nearly impossible. Little consistent pattern can be found for the

TABLE 6

MISCELLANEOUS REQUIRED HOURS

Course	Number requiring	Percent requiring	Range of hours	Mean hours	Number offering
1. Radio	38	19.5	2-8	3.4	98
2. Problems & Seminar	22	11.0	1-6	2.4	32
3. Individual Lessons	9	4.5	1-9	3.7	9
4. Teaching of Speech	8	4.0	1-6	2.7	124
5. Psychology of Speech	7	3.5	2-3	2.5	18

courses required in speech; one department will place greater emphasis on one phase of speech and another on some other one. In all probability, the exact emphasis depends in large measure on the interests of the faculty within a specific department.

Public address is the only phase required with a high degree of consistency. This is to be expected, as the public address area is basic to the whole speech field and was the original focus of attention. However, courses in theatre arts and interpretation are required by over 50% of the departments surveyed and more than one-third of them ask for a course in speech science and one in voice and diction. With the late entrance of radio into the speech field it is not surprising to find such a low course requirement for it. As definite courses were specified for only about 50% of the required hours in speech, the course requirements for all of the phases is remarkably high. Table 7 provides a summary of the required hours in the five major phases of speech and the fundamentals and voice and diction courses.

semester hours; six hours in theatre arts, which undoubtedly would include at least one semester of play production; and, finally, approximately three hours in speech science and three in voice and diction. While it would be satisfying to produce more specific conclusions than these, the data do not warrant them. It is hoped that the results as expressed in the tables may be of assistance to the staff of a department who are attempting to determine the requirements for the major, although no specific and exact recommendations could be established.

It would be interesting and valuable to have a detailed analysis of the offerings of the various departments giving the major in speech to determine what courses are offered in terms of type, number of hours, and so on. At the same time, the sequence of courses, the order in which they are taken, and an examination of the basic requirements for various courses would prove helpful. The testimony of instructors in speech, beyond what is expressed in the catalogues, as to the courses which they consider basic to the general major would be instructive. Continued examination of the speech major on both objective and philosophic bases is necessary for constant evaluation of the speech program.

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF REQUIRED HOURS IN SPEECH

Course	Number requiring	Percent requiring	Range of hours	Mean hours	Number offering
1. Public Address	181	90.5	2-18	6.1	200
2. Theatre Arts	109	54.5	2-32	6.7	200
3. Speech Science	73	36.5	1-12	3.5	200
4. Interpretation	113	56.5	1-9	3.5	200
5. Radio	38	19.5	2-8	3.4	98
6. Fundamentals	32	16.0	1-6	3.6	88
7. Voice & Diction	74	37.0	1-6	2.7	157
Total	191	95.5	2-59	16.5	200

If a general pattern were to be projected for the major it would include about six semester hours in public address, a first course in public speaking, and probably a second course on a more advanced level. There would be a course in interpretation with the value of three

THE FORUM

VOICES FROM THE PAST

As a historian I was very much interested in the stimulating and provocative article in the October 1949 QJS by one of my colleagues, Frederick George Marcham. He has indicated a whole field of research and study in which the historians and the students of speech can collaborate to each other's mutual benefit. As Dr. Marcham pointed out, the historian's contribution of research method and historical background and the rhetorician's contribution of the editing, psychoanalysis, and criticism of the historical records of speech and speakers constituted neglected opportunities for co-operation between these two disciplines. Students of speech have long been working with students of drama, sound technicians, and physiologists; and historians have learned to collaborate with economists, sociologists, and archeologists. What would then be more natural than that historians and students of speech should discover in each other complementary skills and methods?

However, the secret of an outstanding article is what it suggests beyond what it says. And Professor Marcham's article set up within me a whole train of thought on lost horizons and future vistas of historical science.

History deals with people collectively and individually. It tells the story of how man has coped with his physical and social environment. Yet little do we realize that most of his significant wrestling with his social environment has been by voice. Down through the ages the warnings of prophets, the sermons on the mount, the commands of caesars, the dialogues of philosophers, the orations of statesmen, the battle cries of warriors, the howling of mobs, the weeping of widows, the laughter of children, the judgments of magistrates, the curses of the damned—all with tongues of men and angels have swelled the chorus of history 'to the last syllable of recorded time.'

And yet none of these voices has penetrated the iron curtain between the historian and the actual past. History as actuality, like heaven, he must see through a glass darkly. His hand may touch an ancient stone; his eye may read another man's story or perchance gaze upon a photograph or painting; but his ear, should it be cocked to the aft of time, is greeted by a vast sea of silence. That is the most completely lost horizon to the historian and the student of speech.

But for the future pasts, which are rushing by us fast and becoming history as we live, historians and speech experts can work together to preserve its voices and its sounds. Historians, like Professor Marcham himself, are prone to think of historical records as written documents. But our modern technology has made it possible for us to capture the human voice, retrieve it from the past, and hold it for the present. Most important speeches and committee discussions of today take place in the presence of the microphone; they are usually recorded for radio. A vast library of radio recordings in various repositories in our country and abroad is beginning to add a new documentation of the past for man's ear. Telephone conversations, whose loss historians bemoaned, need no longer join the limbo of the forgotten

past; and wire recordings make it possible to track down—even in far-off Tibet—the sounds of strange and epoch-making events while they are happening and preserve them for a listening posterity. Sound films, which likewise can be easily preserved, will furnish an incomparable record of sound and motion and color. No longer will speech and history researchers have to *read* editions of printed speeches—speeches edited later as the speakers wanted them remembered or as past listeners distorted them to fit the prejudices of their minds. We now can have the genuine version with all its hesitations, self-corrections, pronunciations, intonations, and emphases—with all the applause, silences, cheers, and boos of the audience.

Here is one common task for students of speech and history: to work together not only to preserve the recorded speeches, discussions, and conversations in well-catalogued archives but also to take the initiative in getting the significant recordings made. In Professor Marcham's own field I could suggest a specific job, that of persuading the House of Commons to lift its ban on the broadcasting and recording of its debates. But nearer home we should work together, the American Historical Association and the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, to have our Congress and our state legislatures as a part of their standard procedure preserve sound recordings as well as printed records of their deliberations. Joining hands, let us be here highly resolved that in this day of technical progress the spoken syllables of an ever-changing language and the oral word-thoughts of an ever-advancing culture shall never again be omitted from the heritage of future ages.

LYNN M. CASE,
Department of History,
University of Pennsylvania

PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUES—PAST AND PRESENT

In contemporary times, we hear and read about propaganda. Much of the current interest in propaganda originated during World War I. The techniques of propagandists, whether they are contained in oral speeches or written manuscripts, have been analyzed by present-day scholars. We think of propaganda as a relatively recent innovation in persuasive speech. Yet, a number of the observed techniques of propagandists were recognized centuries ago by Richard Hooker, a divine, who lived from 1553 to 1600.

Let us note the correspondences between his observations and those of contemporary writers. In order to win the support of the multitude, according to Hooker,[1] you must first direct attention to the faults of your opponents. This must be done critically and severely. The more zeal you put into your condemnations, the more impressed the multitude will be with your integrity.

In the second step, you impute all the faults and corruptions in the world to your opponents. Make them appear to be responsible for every evil in your government and for all your sufferings. By this step you magnify the weaknesses in your opponents, and of course, you simultaneously expect to enhance the impression in the eyes of the multitude that you are a virtuous person. These two steps bear a remarkable resemblance to what current writers label *bad name calling*. In American society, we brand our opponents with such words as bolshevik, red, communist, atheist, heretic, etc. In presidential campaigns, each political party charges the other political party with bungling practices, jeop-

[1] *The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine Mr. Richard Hooker*, arranged by The Rev. John Keble (Oxford, 1888) 1.146-55.

ardizing the safety of our country, inefficiency in governmental administration, etc.

The third step is the presentation of your program with all the *glorious titles* as the only remedy for the existing evils. Usually, people will imagine that anything whose virtues they have heard will help them. Today, propagandists use *virtue words* or *glittering generalities* to characterize their programs. Our large corporations publicize the number of American families that are stockholders, with the added thought being expressed that such a corporation is truly a democratic institution. Franklin Roosevelt blamed the Republican party for the depression, and the same time he presented his New Deal as the remedy for American ills. President Truman characterized the 80th Congress, dominated by Republicans, as the worst Congress in history. The only remedy was to re-elect him with a democratically controlled Congress.

The fourth step involves the fashioning of your program in such a manner that it will appear to be sanctioned by the Scriptures. Then people will react to your program as they do to the holy words. The attitudes of respect and reverence for divine authority will be also manifested toward you and your program. In contemporary times, this is known as the *transfer device* whereby you associate your platform with the church, democracy, or something that commands prestige. Minority groups compose the mastheads of their literature with the American flag appearing in one corner and their specially chosen emblem in the other corner. Both Hitler and Mussolini paraded themselves as being divinely sent. In international wars, the people on each side pray to God for a victory over the enemy.

The fifth step pertains to whom you should first win to your cause. You must first persuade the most credulous men who accept *pleasing errors*. The pleasing errors consist in demonstrating to them that they are the chosen ones. This is accomplished either through the use of the Scriptures and the revelations contained therein or by citing strong reasons why they should be followers and why you speak first to them. This procedure is in modern times a combination of the *card-stacking* (telling half truths) and the *bandwagon* devices. Some Congressmen who have submitted bills to reduce federal income taxes stress the savings for the common man which are actually very little. These Congressmen say nothing about the enormous savings that their bills will provide for the wealthy people. The Nazi movement made the Nordics feel that they were the chosen ones. The state rightist says that he fears a dictatorship with increasing federal governmental control. Never does he say anything about the private industry groups whom he represents. The latter, of course, expect larger profits under state governmental control than under federal control.

The sixth step involves the use of *testimonials*. Secure testaments that support your program from important persons, and from authorities who have followings of their own. People take pride in identifying themselves with prominent leaders. In modern times, propagandists refer to such activities as *identification*, *association*, *projection*, or the *use of testimonials*. Most advertisers pay prominent persons for written statements that support their products. Hitler awarded the Iron Cross to Lindbergh and Ford, thereby seeking to identify them with the Nazi movement.

The seventh step in a way contradicts the fifth step. Hooker believed that wom-

en could be won to a cause quicker than men because women are more easily influenced by *affections*. Today, we question this assumption of sex differences. However, we do recognize that the propagandist makes extensive use of emotional appeals, and that is what Hooker had in mind when he wrote about the affections. The contemporary propagandist uses positive and negative emotional appeals. In the former, he features sex, desire to be popular, curiosity, luxury and comfort, much for little cost or effort, etc. In the latter, he employs the fear of sickness, old age, ugliness, insecurity, unpopularity, etc.

The last step is an explanation of why you can depend upon the loyalty of your followers. If the preceding steps have been effectively accomplished, your followers will find justifications for their position when attacks are made upon them. Today we designate this behavior pattern by the term *rationalization*.

Hooker thought of these steps as the techniques of propagandists because in a footnote he refers to Christopher Vitel who used some of these steps as one of the *chief propagandists* for a religious sect.

CLARENCE H. SCHETTLER,
Department of Sociology,
Duke University

A PSYCHOLOGIST COMMENTS ON THE DICKENS-HEFFERNAN ARTICLE

I certainly would go along with Professor Dickens and Miss Heffernan in their criticism[1] of experimental studies by psychologists. The latter have not gotten around really to the living heart of discussion, that is, the discussing. Carrying over their experimental-designing techniques they have been preoccupied with balancing groups, equalizing time-intervals, quantifying the work-materials, and the like. There are of course two ways of approach: to get live group discussions a-going on rich and meaningful topics and to introduce more and more adequate quantifying methods on successive projects; *or* to block out formally designs of procedure that seem scientifically and statistically sound, on however trivial moot problems, and then gradually to admit more and more significant and complicated problems into the discussion mills of later projects. One cannot do both, as I see the matter; though the efforts of the workers in 'group dynamics,' so unfortunately given a set-back by Lewin's death, are in that direction.

Again, the point is certainly well taken that what we need is to study off-campus populations. There is much too much generalizing about human nature on the basis of the conveniently-available college sophomores. True, it is hard to get these non-collegiate groups; but it simply has to be done.

Electrical sound recordings by wire and other techniques offer a powerful aid to research; but as the authors remark, no one has yet tackled the job of analyzing such recordings. What seems a feasible program of research by a small team of investigators would be to (a) secure a half-dozen verbatim recordings, (b) play them over and over, so that each member of the team can attempt a qualitative analysis which can presumably later be made the basis of quantitative measurement, (c) compare agreements and disagreements (establishing the 'reliability of observers'), and (d) repeat this procedure until some consensus on some general categories begins to emerge.

Let me add a particularized note.

[1] Experimental Research in Group Discussion, QJS 35 (1949).23-29.

Nothing in the field of group discussion has impressed me so much as the finding that apparently the effectiveness of a discussion depends upon the variety or range of opinions held by the participants *as known* to all of them. So little has been done to verify the conclusions of Jenness' pioneer experiment! And yet, I wonder whether it is not the presentation of different viewpoints that is more important than the arguing of inductive or deductive nature. Cannot group thinking be pictured on the analogy of individual thinking; and cannot the group cast about much as the individual does, hoping that the bright idea will come? And just as the latter's thinking is the more effective the more resourceful and original his thoughts, so the former's is likewise, in proportion to the variety of contributed suggestions. But that is theory: what we want is controlled observations.

JOHN F. DASHIELL,
Department of Psychology,
University of California
at Los Angeles

TWENTY YEARS LATER

In 1929, as part of my Master's Thesis under the direction of Professor Mabie, I made a survey of the teaching of dramatic art in secondary schools very similar to that described by Ernest Bavely in the October issue of the QJS. The difference lay in the form of the question: 'What do you consider the chief educational outcome of your teaching of dramatic art?' and the fact that it was addressed to teachers rather than to students. The replies received were almost identical with those reported by Mr. Bavely. Almost unanimously the writers said: 'Dramatics develops personality. This is its chief function in the high school program.'

Being ever a Doubting Thomas, Professor Mabie urged me to set up an experimental situation which would attempt to prove or disprove these sometimes extravagant claims. The results have been published in this JOURNAL. Enough it is to say that, by means of psychological tests as well as carefully recorded observations, evidence of progress toward emotional balance, social adjustment, and personal effectiveness was pretty clearly established. By comparison, a 'control group' which studied regular English under my instruction, alas, grew measurably worse.

The purpose of secondary education, ever since the day of the Seven Cardinal Principles, is the adjustment of the adolescent to his environment and the development of him into a happy, useful citizen. Judging by the criteria set up by teachers' colleges and the N.E.A., dramatic art is the most effective tool in the curriculum for general education. Of course no administrator would admit it or even dream of such a possibility.

Still, after twenty years of teaching in the same school where I had worked out my experiments, I frequently find myself facing a class of misfits, personality problems, and discipline cases, placed there by a trusting educational advisor or agitated homeroom teachers.

Do I teach them *personality? I do not!* I teach *theatre* . . . and more theatre. I fill their minds and their minutes so jammed with the many aspects of play production that they have no time for mischief. In the intense group life that centers around the school stage, misfits suddenly *belong*. Youngsters who are problems to themselves and their elders are resolved through assuming vicariously the problems of other people. There is no question about it . . . active participation in the arts of the theatre does set the high school player

apart as more 'mature' than the average seventeen-year-old.

The evidence is not purely subjective. Check any high school that has an active dramatic department or club and you will find a situation similar to that existing at Heights. More than half of the copy for the literary magazine is supplied by Players; the editors of the school paper, officers in major school activities, winners of contests and awards, the outstanding boy or girl of the year . . . all of these honors within a group totalling seventy-five in a school whose enrollment is two thousand. The frequent parties of the Players are a mystery to the other students. Why? Because the merry-makers are content to sit on the floor, listen to classical music, and discuss plays and philosophy. Just last week a remarkable story gladdened my soul. The head of the history department, a conservative and hard-boiled teacher, made the public comment that he preferred the Players to all other students because they thought independently and could express themselves adequately. In 1948 and again in 1949 the National Harvard Four Year Scholarship was awarded to Heights boys. Both were Players. Both were queer little ducks when they joined the club in their first year. It was not scholarship alone that won for them the Harvard award.

The point I wish to make is this. The developing or maturing of personality is an inevitable by-product of experience in the arts of the theatre. The more intense the activity, the more obvious the results. The more successful the young actor is in a given role, the more he gets out of it and the more it does for him. This eliminates the horror of casting against type for the purpose of correcting personality defects. The teacher who assumes the responsibility of a psychiatrist is treading on dangerous ground. I am filled with foreboding at Mr. Bavely's barely expressed idea that our courses be consciously directed towards the goals of emotional control and personality adjustment. No! A thousand times NO! Let us teach with all our skill an honest approach to the ancient arts of the drama. Let us produce the very best plays we are capable of. Let us fill our students with intelligent love for the theatre. If we do this job well, we may stop, and please, dear colleagues, there let us stop!

DINA REES EVANS,
Heights High School,
Cleveland Heights, Ohio

CREATIVE EVALUATION: AFFIRMATION versus NEGATION

Are we teaching for maturity? If we answer in the negative, no doubt we need to look beyond the classroom to the individual student. If it is true that 'the only real threat to man is man himself,' then the only real threat to the student of speech is the student himself, his fellow students, and his teacher. But perhaps we have eyes and do not see and ears and do not hear. Do we know the difficulties the student has with himself because of his fears, his prejudices, and hates? Some brought with him, yes; and others brought forth in class by early, sharp, and lengthy criticism. The student agonizes, falters, and soon fails; and the teacher has surely failed.

Perhaps we need to talk in terms of the mature mind. The teacher who uses, not negative criticism, but 'creative evaluation' helps the student grow toward maturity. In his book, *The Mature Mind*, Dr. Harry A. Overstreet tells us that the mature mind affirms his fellow man. You have seen the wonders affirmation works on the playground,

at home, and in business. Try it in the classroom.

First, find something good in the student's speech and state the affirmation in warm friendly terms. *Now*, make your specific suggestion and indicate what steps the student might well take to realize the improvement. (Beware of negations that merely build up your own egocentric power: 'You know you were indirect. You certainly looked at the floor enough. You're just static!') Try this approach: 'If you believe that effective speech wins a response, you'll want to be aware of whether you're receiving a response from each one of us. And, as you're speaking, be sure that you include those of us on the front row and those to your left and right as well as the others.' *Then*, conclude with an affirmation, such as: 'Your illustrations were well chosen, John, and indicated excellent observation on your part.'

Creative evaluation is a means to better adjustment. It indicates understanding and skill whereby the teacher aids the student to *bring into being* certain qualities, principles, and skills; and in turn the student develops a sense of well-being. There will be no insecurity from destructive criticism, but rather growth toward maturity from affirmative foundations.

RUTH R. HAUN,
The University of Pittsburgh

A REPORT ON HEARING REHABILITATION IN AUSTRALIA

The question of educating the deaf in Australia seems to be the usual one. The Manual Method was introduced first, and as in America, took strong roots and wished to stay unchanged. Then, some ambitious, interested parent of a deaf child would seek oral education in another area or country, returning (after speech had developed) to the home area and immediately the oral movement would be underway. For Australia is no different than any other country in wanting its exceptional children to develop (as near as possible) to the normal standards. So in the City of Adelaide has developed the South Australian Oral Kindergarten, where at present the writer is in charge as Speech Director.

To explain the Kindergarten's position in the Educational System of South Australia, it is best to go into a short explanation of the general educational program. Also, the normal school education is carried on both by private schools and Education Department Schools. The latter correspond to the American public schools.

The education of the hard of hearing and the deaf falls into four major categories:

1. Slight loss—Education Department Classes

In the first category is the education of hard of hearing children whose loss is slight and can be compensated by classroom seating, medical treatment, or careful watching of assignments by teacher and parent. This teaching is done in the Education Department classes or could be done in private schools.

2. More severely deafened—Education Department Opportunity Classes

In the second category is the education of the more severely deafened. In this group the children will need early training (children and parents) then when trained, fitted with hearing aids. When speech, lip reading and reading readiness are sufficiently developed, such children can go into Education Department opportunity rooms or special classes.

3. Severe loss—oral training

The third category is that one which includes the children who, after early training, are unable to be educated in Education Department schools because of the severe loss. Hearing aids cannot bring in enough speech sounds, but the children can learn by the oral method. They can learn speech, lip reading and reading in the special school using the oral techniques.

4. Extremely deaf—finger spelling and manual

The fourth category in this program of education is the group whose deafness is so severe that, after early oral training, it is still unable to fit into the former three groups. Here the finger-spelling and manual methods are being used. In Adelaide this school is a private school subsidized by the State Government. It is a residential school in which there are about sixty children—both deaf and blind being educated in the same school.

In the summary of these four groups, it must be added that all concerned with this special education are interested in moving the children along from one category to another, as it may benefit the specific child and his ability to gain by the more advanced normal or near normal classroom teaching.

One other factor that must be included in this discussion is the fact that the State Government in the past has not made complete provision for the teaching of the exceptional children. Much of this teaching has been carried on by private groups. However, there are plans under way at present for more participation on the part of the State Government in the subsidizing of this special education. An example of this is seen at present in the establishment of the Acoustic Laboratory, where the Commonwealth Government, working within the established Department of Health, has set up this Laboratory in each capital city to aid the hard of hearing and deafened soldier in rehabilitation. However, the Laboratory has gone one step further and now gives audiometer tests to children of all ages and helps in the advice and selection of hearing aids. There is such a laboratory in Adelaide and it is of great assistance to the Kindergarten.

The South Australian Oral Kindergarten, Incorporated, is fitting into the educational needs of the before mentioned groups by providing that early oral training. In its present and future plans, it will go one step further and fit into the continued teaching of the needs of the children, who will benefit by the oral method beyond the kindergarten stage.

There are twenty-six children attending the Oral Kindergarten at the present. These twenty-six are divided into three groups; 8 in pre-kindergarten; 8 in kindergarten; and 10 in the first part of Grade One of elementary school. There are three teachers on the staff. These teachers were trained in regular classroom teaching for the elementary and kindergarten stages. Their teaching the deaf has been helped by a former director who was trained at the Central Institute for the deaf. The school is doing splendid work in giving to its children a well-rounded program with emphasis on speech, lip reading, and reading—art work, rhythm, and games are included. The school program begins at 9:30 A.M., the youngest group leaves at 12:30 P.M., while the older ones leave at 3 P.M.

On 5 September 1949, the South Australian Oral Kindergarten moved into a nine-room brick house. Here, with ample space for school and play grounds many plans are being made for extend-

ing and improving the present work. The first major plan is that of auditory training. With plans under way for building group hearing equipment which can be used with microphone, speakers, victrola and radio, each group of children will have an auditory training program every day.

Also, individual daily speech lessons are now going into the program. With the increased space, there is now room for parent classes which are conducted one afternoon and one evening a week. The parents can now go into the classrooms to observe, help, and eventually teach. It is hoped that visual education will soon be included in the regular school day.

Like many schools, the South Australian Oral Kindergarten is interested in securing additional teachers. The school has made for itself a definite place among the general educational organizations of the State of South Australia. As the school continues to grow and develop, it will make for itself a permanent place in the education of the deaf and hard of hearing in this country, comparable with those in the United States, Britain, and other countries.

ROMA HAYWORTH,
Adelaide, South Australia

MORE ABOUT NUMERALS

Professor Gray's comments in the October 1949 QJS about my study, A Child's Learning of Numerals (QJS 35 (1949).202-09), are very welcome. I presented a factual record of one child's learning of numerals as source material for other scholars to apply to their field of interest, be it linguistics, speech, psychology, or pedagogy. As a linguist I was aware of the parallels which Professor Gray cites; but he has arranged facts about the numerals of 'primitive' languages more neatly than I have seen it done before.

The application which he has given to my materials, however, bears some further analysis. I am afraid the etymological reasoning which he applies to 'primitive' numerals does not tell the whole story. It is a common illusion among laymen and even among linguists that the pre-history of a word form, its etymology, reveals adequately the complex of meaning attached to the word descriptively. If we applied the same reasoning to English, we would have to conclude that speakers of English have no numerical concepts exceeding ten; for it is obvious that the numerals 13-19 are mere additions to ten, and closer etymological study shows that 11 and 12 are also words marking the excess of 1 and 2 over ten. Among the ordinals, as low a number as *second* is not only borrowed, but is no genuine numeral at all, since it means etymologically 'the following one.'[1] It would be misinterpreting the facts to say that modern English speakers and writers still use the elementary processes revealed by the etymology when they employ *second* and the numerals above ten. Through long and frequent practice, the process of counting, of addition and multiplication has become so abridged and rapid that these numerals have become abstract and convey a numerical meaning quickly, without resort to the manipulations indicated by their form. This is certainly true for their use by mathematicians; but it applies also to their everyday handling by adult laymen. I have always suspected that the situation is, to a certain extent, compar-

[1] For details, see one of the editions of Walter W. Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. For the parallel situation in German, see Friedrich Kluge, Alfred Götze, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Deutschen Sprache*, Berlin (14th ed.) 1948.

able in the 'primitive' languages; that the etymological form of their numerals does not do justice to the degree of abstractness which they have reached in present-day speech. Linguists would do well to re-examine primitive numerals in the light of this consideration, to separate their descriptive meaning from the form and its history.

In my article, I have made this distinction between numerical words and numerical concepts in child language. Here the situation is reversed: words run ahead of concepts. I believe Professor Gray is too optimistic in assuming that my analysis reveals 'quite what one would expect.' Children's facility in counting and their operating with high numerals misleads many observers into assuming that their numerical thinking is much better developed than it actually is. One reader of my article confessed his first impression that my children were unusually slow in learning numerals; but in checking on the numerals of his own children he found that their higher numerals were much less clear in meaning and even in sequence than he had thought. I believe a sharpening of attention in this regard was needed for the benefit of future observers.

Professor Gray cites French numerals, which incidentally display remnants of the vigesimal system. He might also have cited Danish, where 50 is expressed as 'half-three-times-twenty,' that is to say, half of the third score added to two scores—a system which is still more complicated than the 'simple' multiplication and addition of 'three score and ten.' The Romans used subtraction as well as addition: 18 and 19 were for them 'two-from-twenty' and 'one-from-twenty'—an operation which strikes us nowadays as inconvenient and makes Roman numerals difficult for the modern learner.

Needless to say, anything but addition is outside the field of children's learning of numerals. This note merely follows the thread of thought spun by Professor Gray a little further. It is meant as a warning against underrating the numerical thinking of 'primitives' and against overrating that of small children.

WERNER F. LEOPOLD,
Department of German
Northwestern University

DANIEL JONES ON A PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTION

TO THE EDITOR:

I was interested to see your proof of phonetic transcripts in the October 1949 issue.

It is hardly possible for me to give much in the way of comment on your Frenchman's pronunciation. If the transcript is an exact reproduction of the record, there is really nothing to be said except that his pronunciation surprises me very much, and does not correspond in many respects with what I am accustomed to hear from French people.

I should have expected for instance that all his *r*'s would be uvular [ʁ], and in particular that he would put an [ʁ] in before the [t] of *Arthur*. I notice that *rat*, *never* and *making* are all represented as having the same vowel. That surprises me. French people generally use [e] (their *é*) in *making*, but a very open [ɛ] in *never* and an [a] in *rat*. [ðæs] for *thus* is also unusual in my experience. French people generally use either [œ] (their sound in *œuf*) or [a] for our [ʌ]. Also it is very unusual for them to be able to pronounce [ɪ] and [ʊ]; they commonly substitute [i] and [u] for them.

On the other hand your text does reproduce some of the characteristic French

faults, such as the wrong stressing of *specific* (though I should have expected [ˈspesiˈfik] and assimilations like those in [laɪg ˈðɪs], [ˈkwaɪdːˈɛd] (though I should have expected [i] for [ɪ]).

Yours very truly,
DANIEL JONES

P.S. I have now retired from the University, and my address is as below.

3, Marsham Way,
Gerrard's Cross,
Bucks., England

A NOTE FROM OUR EDITOR OF PHONETIC TRANSCRIPTIONS

It would be most pleasant if we could have many comments like that so kindly sent in by Professor Jones. As Professor Jones points out, the phonetic transcription of a specific utterance is the record of that utterance and nothing more. What is typical of the dialect group to which the speaker belongs is known to be typical on the basis of wide experience with the dialect, not on the one utterance. What is atypical remains atypical, whether it is part of the particular speaker's general pattern or happens to appear here as a noncharacteristic slip. There is no obligation on the transcriber to point out such distinctions.

But there is scope for the pleasant exercise of the phonetic faculty in speculating upon the determinants of specific pronunciations, whether or not one arrives at the right explanation. Thus Miss Brigance's Frenchman (QJS 35:353, October 1949) had studied English in France, probably Southern-British pronunciation, and had used (studied?) it in the United States, probably in the company of GA speakers. He had by no means mastered the language, either way. Perhaps when he picked up *Arthur* by eye and turned it out as [ˈɑɪœɔ], he managed to get the stress Englished, the first sound according to British *r*-less speech and the last sound a GA *r* off-glide, but slipped on the middle of the word rather in the French fashion.

So for *rat* and *making*, presented as eye stimuli, he may have turned out the same vowel, *a* = [e]. There is no implication that he substituted [e] for [æ]; a Frenchman might have studied English for some time without making *rat* part of his vocabulary. As for *never* —this is stretching the guess pretty far —it may be that in France his study of English was conditioned by British phonetic notation with [ɛɪ] and [e] having much in common, and the lesson only partly learned.

One must also, of course, take into consideration the hazards of transcription. We cannot demand and, if we are not too fussy, we can get along without absolute accuracy in transcriptions not part of scientific study. We can assume that this transcriber means [e] by [e] because she has [eː], [eᵻ], and [eɪ] in this and other transcriptions of the series (December QJS). We can't be quite certain whether the [œ] in *Arthur* represents the speaker's attempt to avoid the known-to-be-wrong French [y] or a slight slip on the part of a transcriber not altogether familiar with the non-GA sound. The [a] of [ˈhaswɔ] for *answer* ([h] readily explained as effort of a natively *h*-less speaker to master an *h*-ful language and [w] as eye stimulus) may be an effort to avoid nasalization of the vowel and failure to get in the compensating nasal consonant; or it may be that the transcriber from Indiana does not recognize nasalization as a noteworthy feature of vowels. It seems odd that no nasal vowel appears in this transcription of a speaker not altogether deconditioned from French.

One could go on. It's rather fun.

(There are no Phonetic Transcriptions in this issue of the JOURNAL because no manuscripts turned up. It is highly desirable that transcriptions be contributions and not synthetics out of the home office. Our thanks to Miss Brigance and all the others who have contributed.)

LEE S. HULTZEN,
University of Illinois

LITERATURE'S ORPHAN CHILD

A legend of long standing in radio circles indicts dramatic art and literary criticism not for their long neglect of radio writing but for their lack of concern during the first few years of the infant's life. According to legend, George Bernard Shaw was asked to write for radio in the early twenties, when the new medium needed the talent of an established writer. But Shaw scoffed and turned an indignant back to the infant, radio writing. The Shaw legend is typical of the reception radio writing received from most established writers. With this unfortunate beginning, radio recruited promising young newspaper writers, unestablished playwrights, and other unknown authors. Less than a score of established writers dared risk their reputations on the new 'music box fad'; yet, many unknown writers have risen to prominence in the field of radio writing. The reputations of the established authors, such as Archibald MacLeish, Stephen Vincent Benét, Alice Duer Miller, have grown as a result of radio.

1

If radio flourishes and gains as much vigor in the next few years as it has in its first quarter century a significant body of writing must of necessity be evaluated in its relation to American literature. Moreover, there exists today radio material, according to Charles Seipmann, 'altogether relevant to the teaching of English literature.'[1] Albert Crews, Archibald MacLeish, Arch Obler, and numerous other pioneers in radio literature have made similar predictions.

Although, comparatively speaking, a small amount of radio writing of literary merit is in existence, the cry from the partisians of radio drama for literary recognition, divorced from the literature of the theatre, has grown until the term *radio literature* can be heard along with the radio critics' charges of 'overcommercialism' and 'soap suds art.' The first discussion came from Richard Hughes, the first writer of a play exclusively for broadcast. Although his article makes the case for radio literature seem doomed before it reaches childhood, he concludes with hope that all literaure will be influenced by radio's aural appeal and that in the future all literature will be composed to be heard as well as to be read from the printed page. Because poet and orator are no longer synonymous terms, a literary revolution of such proportions must of necessity consume an unlimited span of time, as long, possibly, as the transition in the Middle Ages from spoken to printed literature.[2]

2

As a means of mass communication the value of radio is recognized by every thinking person. The importance of the medium in molding public opinion and influencing mass behavior was graphically shown in 1939 when Orson Welles and his Mercury Theater broadcast 'The War of the Worlds.' Thousands of

[1] Charles Seipmann, *Radio's Second Chance*, Boston (1946).264.

[2] The Second Revolution: Literature & Radio, Richard Hughes, *Virginia Quarterly Review* (Winter, 1947).39.

Americans were thrown into panic by the seemingly realistic portrayal of interplanetary warfare. Sociologically, radio is great force; this fact is granted.

Communication, advertising, and propaganda have established their claims to the brain-child of Clerk Maxwell and Hertz. But writers have ceased to be 'ear' minded; they write for the eye alone. Radio would have been a great boon to the medieval minstrels; for then the ear was the poet's primary concern. Nevertheless, literary men want a medium of expression that will reach a great audience. Radio is just such a medium. Audiences of 35,000,000 listened to a Roosevelt broadcast; radio executives consider an audience of merely a million people as 'talking to one's self.'[3]

Every form of expression has its limitations. As Goethe said: 'it is working within limits that the craftsman reveals himself.' Radio has its limitations, yet it also has distinct advantages. Morton Wishengrad, in the introduction to his collection of radio plays, *The Eternal Light,* stated that critics mean to attack not radio drama but the cultural climate it portrays. 'For radio does not create a culture, it expresses it. Radio drama is a medium of culture. It is a tool. . . . There have been sustaining programs to prove this each year; radio is a medium of drama that is versatile, economical, and good.'[4]

Wishengrad asserts that radio is a good medium for drama, for the two reasons that it is versatile and economical. Radio is also a good medium in that it is essentially poetic. It reaches thousands, even millions of listeners with an appeal only to one sense, a sense that is the key to the stimulation of imagination. Yet, notwithstanding this great advantage, radio has disadvantages—conditions that many authors have refused to accept. Chief among these is the one-night-stand rule. Why should a good radio drama be relegated to the files after one performance? Many radio writers and critics agree that good radio drama is worth repeating, an opinion which has been strengthened by the success of 'Sorry, Wrong Number' and other radio encores. Another disadvantage upon which all radio writers agree is that most radio authors are anonymous. The will to write, psychologists tell us, is based upon a certain amount of ego or desire for recognition. But writers in radio receive little credit for their 8,000,000 words a day. A network serial writer must turn out the equivalent of several full-length novels a year, yet his name is rarely mentioned on the air or in the radio columns of the newspapers.

The great volume produced by radio authors is in itself a handicap to writing of quality. Arch Obler,[5] one of the best radio authors, believes that many writers for broadcasting feel that they are 'written out' after a few years, because they produce in a few years the volume that most novelists and playwrights produce in a life time.

3

Radio needs less writing and writing of a higher quality, if a body of literature of lasting value is to be accumulated.

Great writing is not produced every day by poets, novelists, or playwrights *or* radio writers. Radio writers must, before despairing of their present plight, realize 1. writing of merit is not done in a hurry; and 2. the writer hates to see

[3] Norman Corwin, *The Radio Primer*: Radio Broadcast, CBS, March 1941.

[4] Morton Wishengrad, *The Eternal Light*, New York (1947)xiii, xv.

[5] Arch Obler, *The Obler Omnibus*, New York (1945).

his work die with only one performance.[6] If these two barriers are eliminated radio drama will have room to flourish and expand into the promise it offers to talented writers. There is a challenge to young authors and established authors in this new medium:

> Every pioneer must live in more rigorous circumstances than the people who follow. Writers who elect radio as a career are distinctly pioneers. They are certainly not the pioneers they were ten years ago, but no medium comes to full maturity in 24 years; radio drama as a serious art is even younger than that.
>
> To offset the immaturity of the medium and the lack of artistic adulthood there is a tremendous audience available to the radio dramatist.[7]

Radio drama has promise, and this promise can be realized in time. It is a new medium, but maturity is not far away. Radio and television have in the past five years advanced far toward artistic recognition. Many colleges and universities now have departments of radio devoted not only to training radio performers and intelligent listeners but to conducting research that will be of invaluable aid to the radio dramatist of the future. Charles Seipmann wrote in *Radio's Second Chance* (which was published after the Federal Communications Commission published the 'Blue Book' and set up new standards) that radio is the greatest means of communication ever devised. 'Writing for radio,' he further stated, 'is altogether relevant to the teaching of English literature. In radio workshops this may incidentally lead to the recruitment to the industry of new talent and new ideas for the perfection of a new art form.'[8] In that sentence Mr. Seipmann stressed the need of the radio drama today, enlightened and sympathetic criticism. Radio needs enlightened critics. English scholars and speech scholars are the two academic groups best equipped to give valuable service to a new, struggling literary form.

A volume of radio plays edited by Joseph Liss and entitled *Radio's Best Plays* made an inauspicious apperance in 1947.[9] More recent is the publication of *Plays from Radio*, edited by Lass, McGill, and Axelrod,[10] a volume of radio plays selected for their literary significance, and launched as 'relevant to the study of English literature.' These two books cogently present the problem that faces scholars of dramatic literature and literary critics when faced with evaluation of radio drama.

Plays from Radio and *Radio's Best Plays* are not the only anthologies available, but they are the only two that attempt to evaluate the material using a literary mean. Other collections are Max Wylie's *Best Broadcast Series*, Corwin's, Obler's, Benét's several volumes,[5] and the poetic radio dramas of Archibald MacLeish.

4

These recent works are attempts to evaluate and preserve the best of recent radio writing. The most obvious limitation of these books is the preponderance of material adapted from other media. A complete survey of radio writing for the purpose of a systematic classification of the available material waits to be accomplished.

The cooperation of radio writers, the broadcasting industry, and the departments of speech, drama, radio, and English in American universities is needed for any thorough appraisal of the radio writing now filed away with local radio stations and networks.

[6] Albert Crews, *Professional Radio Writing*, Boston (1946), 228.
[7] Ibid, 230.
[8] Seipmann, 264.
[9] Joseph Liss, *Radio's Best Plays*, New York (1947).
[10] Lass, McGill, & Axelrod, *Plays From Radio*, Boston (1948).

Following the collection and classification of radio writing, an evaluation of published radio scripts now on paper, as well as electrical transcriptions, should lead to the formulation of standards for radio literature. Then radio drama could be related to the body of criticism that has come down as part of our literary heritage.

The accomplishment of these two objectives in the near future would afford two distinct advantages to both the academic and the professional radio author: 1. availability of radio literature for study and investigation by students in the fields of radio and English literature; and 2. an artistic discipline for radio writing. A long term project designed to collect, classify, and evaluate all existing radio writing and provide for the evaluation of future radio writing would be of inestimable value. With this help radio drama might then take its place as a distinct literary form.

WILLIAM A. NAIL,
Extension Service,
University of Alabama

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE 1949-50 DEBATE PROPOSITION

In the course of a discussion concerning interpretations of the intercollegiate debate topic at a recent forensic conference the question arose as to whether an affirmative stand for the socializing of all industry encompasses a support for the socializing of basic non-agricultural industries. The conflicting opinions prompt the following explanation.

The question involved is: when are two propositions substantially identical? It seems clear that the answer will be found in comparing results. This is the assumption here used to examine the reasoning that a good argument for socialism establishes the value of nationalizing basic industry.

Some of the assured differences in nationalizing part or all of the economy will be: the variance in the cost, the shift of power, the concentration of power, the amount of private ownership remaining, the amount of central planning, the size of the government debt, the resulting use of private capital, the status of the labor union, the position of the strike, the conservation of natural resources, the stabilization of the economy.

But even a hasty survey indicates that a difference of the amount of nationalization in its effect upon any one of the above, to say nothing of the interrelated effects demonstrates that a defense for neither one of the propositions under consideration constitutes a plea for the other. For instance, it might well be shown that the government can purchase basic industries without disastrous financial results and that a purchase of all would end in calamity. Or one might well argue that the 'boom and bust' of our present economy can not be effectively met without complete socialization, that partial socialization is but a gesture. Or, from another point of view, it is obvious that no man would defend the thesis that the concentration of economic power by the nationalization of basic industries and the concentration of power by total nationalization are identical. And further, no one would care to argue that the difference in the concentration of power is inconsquential. Why is it then that a good many folks insist that a presentation of the fundamental tenets of socialism argues the affirmative in the present debate topic?

It is a case of building a conclusion upon two irrelevent bits of information. First, some point out that if all industry is socialized, basic industry will be socialized. This is the undoubted truth. It

amounts to an expression of the axiom that the whole includes the part. But the fact has no bearing upon effects and it is the effect with which we are concerned. Consider an analogy. A dozen aspirins include ten more than two. Who will accept the proposition that the consequences of taking twelve is the same as that of taking two? That the whole includes the part in no way establishes the conclusion that the effects of the whole and the part are identical. Second, those who support the contention that total socialism is a defense of partial socialism justify by quoting the often cited statement that the affirmative may add to its burden of proof, if it cares to, so long as it sufficiently defends the stated proposition. Again, the evidence does not apply. To defend the socialization of all industry is *not* an addition to the proposition. It amounts to breaking down the delimiter of the proposition. The word *basic* whatever it may be interpreted to mean implies the existence and preservation of privately owned non-basic industry. In truth one may legitimately advocate the nationalization of *basic* industries plus (+) the establishment of, let us say, a court of compulsory labor arbitration. Technically, in like manner one may argue for the nationalization of basic industries plus the nationalization of the rest of industry. However, in the latter proposition, as in the former, the values of the two burdens must be argued separately and may be related only as complements. Of course, to carry out such an awkard technicality reduces the proposition to absurdity, for the dual statement immediately suggests the mutual counter-effects which have been discussed. To illustrate, the argument to nationalize basic industry (for the sake of expediency or for the sincere preservation of much of our economy) implicitly defends private ownership in non-basic industry. But the added burden, in contradiction, denounces the virtue of saving any amount of private enterprise. The argument for total socialism when proposed in the technically legitimate form clearly reveals that it is not an addition to the original proposition but is an escape from the original proposition by means of destroying the limiting word in the statement. To break down the determiners of a proposition and to add to the proposition are not identical concepts. The belief, then, that a plea for socialism constitutes a defense for the nationalization of basic industries is a conclusion based on two pieces of irrelevant evidence.

CHARLES T. BROWN,
Western Michigan College of Education

ANOTHER VIEW ON THE 1949-50 DEBATE QUESTION

I have read the comments by Professor Charles T. Brown with interest, for I also was in attendance at the National Forensic Conference held at Purdue University on November 17 and 18. I heard Professor Brown explain his reason for giving an adverse decision to an affirmative team using the stand here questioned by Professor Brown. As it happened, I judged the same team which used this same case in the next round of debating. The affirmative team won this debate not because of the case, but because they were not fully enjoined by the negative. The negative was offered an excellent advantage which they did not entirely recognize or use. The first affirmative speaker gave the *plan* which is oftener proposed by the second affirmative debater. Thus with an unusual case and with a legitimate departure from the stock sequence in the case, the affirmative kept the negative 'off balance'

throughout the debate. This accomplished the purpose the affirmative sought. At least the negative did not seize upon the advantage they were given, possibly due to the surprise factor.

It seems to me that the question involved is whether an affirmative team may add to its burden of proof by offering an extension of the proposition. This may add to the burden in two ways. First, it accepts the *socialization* of industry as going further than *nationalization* of industry, and second, it proposes to socialize *all* industry instead of just the *basic* industries. This does no damage to the idea that the principle is a good one. It may strengthen it if the affirmative wishes to extend the benefits of socialization further along the continum. The national question as now stated *excludes* the nationalization of *agricultural industries* which can either mean that it would be undesirable in those industries and therefore not entirely good in principle or it may mean that the question would be less usable in debate without this limitation.

It is likely that this affirmative team, which is a very experienced duo, may have wished to do a little early season experimenting. They probably did not expect to use this case later. I feel that it is a dangerous case for its users as it grants too much advantage to the negative and adds an extra burden to the affirmative. The affirmative must place their chief hope on catching the negative by surprise and unprepared to meet this interpretation. I would support the affirmative's right to use this case but an alert negative should have less difficulty in meeting such an affirmative case than an affirmative case of a more conventional interpretation. But it should be analyzed and refuted by the negative rather than by the judge. If the negative is offered this advantage, then the negative should quickly proceed to accept and refute the affirmative proposal.

PAUL CARMACK,
Ohio State University

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

DOUGLAS EHNINGER, *Editor*

SOURCE MATERIALS FOR SPEECH IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The high school teacher of speech wants to make the best possible use of the professional literature of his field. That literature covers a good many topics and types of sources. The editor's invitation to present these sources in brief review is a challenge. The plan adopted for this review is a discussion of the literature in terms of types of content to be covered and representative publications. Any important work unmentioned will not long remain unknown to the teacher who seriously follows the suggested program of study.

1. Our first concern must be with a philosophy of the subject we teach. Just what is this subject we call speech? What is its background? Objectives? Procedures? How does it fit into the curriculum? The report of Drummond's Committee on *Speech Training and Public Speaking in Secondary Schools*[1] written twenty-five years ago provides a good start on the answers to the problems. Two recent reports of committees of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA published by The National Association of Secondary School Principals provide modern treatments of the answers to these questions.[2] Several additional reports of our Speech Associations are to be published by forthcoming issues of these bulletins. Still other issues of these bulletins are a useful source of general information about the modern school. The pages of the volumes of THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH are the best single source of these materials. The presidential addresses of the presidents of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION, reports of secondary school committees, special articles on various aspects of the speech program are rich in their suggestions for the orientation of the teacher of speech to his work. The index to the table of contents lists several hundred such articles from Analysis of Needs to Values-Results.[3] The high school teacher should also make it a point to subscribe to his regional and state association publications, and attend state, regional, and national conferences on speech education. Although the discussions of speech in professional conferences cannot be documented, one cannot ignore their value as source material for speech education.

2. The teacher who seeks a start on the accumulation of knowledge on the texts of the field might well begin with the general texts. These are the texts that have been written for the high school course of one semester or a year. The course may be given in the junior high school, or more frequently, in the senior high school.

[1] Alexander M. Drummond, editor, *Speech Training and Public Speaking for Secondary Schools*. New York: The Century Company, 1925. ix + 291.

[2] Franklin H. Knower, editor, The Role of Speech in the Secondary School, *The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 29: No. 133, 1945, and Speech Education for All American Youth, 32: No. 151, 1948.

[3] Franklin H. Knower, compiler, *Table of Contents of the Quarterly Journal of Speech 1915-1948*, and *Speech Monographs 1934-1948, with an Index*. University of Missouri, Columbia: Speech Association of America, 1949. See especially pp. 39-42.

In choosing the text for this course it will be important to look for balance in its coverage of the fundamental processes and common types of speech activities; the variety and quality of its exercises; the accuracy, quality, and motivation in its writing, illustrations, and printing; its suggestions for diagnosis and evaluation of speech achievement; the particular philosophy of speech from which it is it written; the appropriateness of the book for the needs and interests of the students who are to use it; the curriculum in which you are to teach the course; and such matters as school grade in which the course is taught, what other speech training, if any, precedes or follows it, and the length of the course. Three good senior high school texts which would rate high on most of these criteria are Hedde and Brigance's *American Speech*,[4] Weaver and Borchers' *Speech*,[5] and Sarett, Foster, and McBurney's *Speech*.[6] Hedde and Brigance have a well-balanced book written in the language of the high school student with larger sections devoted to interpretation and dramatics than the other two. The book by Weaver and Borchers is strongest on its treatment of informal everyday speech, business speech, and the fundamental processes. The Sarett, Foster, and McBurney book leans more heavily to the formal types of speech such as public speaking and panel discussion.

There are other books which should be considered for special situations. Smith, Krefting, and Lewis' *Everyday Speech*[7] is adaptable to the course stressing informal speech activities taught in a progressive curriculum. Barber's *Speech Education*[8] would be particularly useful where one needs a book with strong stress on voice and articulation problems. Borchers' *Living Speech*[9] is a good choice for a junior high school text. The teacher who wants to explore further should consult the book review and advertising sections of the professional journals of the field.

3. If you plan to teach public speaking, discussion, or debate as a course you will want a text designed for this purpose. Winans and Hudson,[10] Painter,[11] Whitney,[12] and Fort[13] are designed as texts for public speaking courses. The first two of these books appear to this reviewer to be more comprehensive, better motivated, and more attractively arranged than the others. There is little in the way of discussion text material specifically prepared for the high school. Judson and Judson[14] may be classified in this category. The teacher, however, should get much that she can use from such college discussion texts as Baird,[15] Ewbank and Auer,[16] and McBurney and Hance.[17] There is more and better high

[4] Wilhelmina G. Hedde and William Norwood Brigance, *American Speech*. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1942. xi+596 pp.

[5] Andrew Thomas Weaver and Gladys Louise Borchers, *Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1946. ix+566 pp.

[6] Lew Sarett, William Trufant Foster, and James H. McBurney, *Speech*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1947. iv+490 pp.

[7] Harley Smith, Clara E. Krefting, and E. E. Lewis, *Everyday Speech*. New York: American Book Company, 1941. xvi+179 pp.

[8] Sara M. Barber, *Speech Education*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1939. xvi+485 pp.

[9] Gladys Louis Borchers, *Living Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1946. x+289 pp.

[10] J. A. Winans and Hoyt H. Hudson, *A First Course in Public Speaking*. New York: The Century Company, 1931. xvii+349 pp.

[11] Margaret Painter, *Ease in Speech*. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1943. viii+456 pp.

[12] Leon K. Whitney, *Directed Speech*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1943. x+386 pp.

[13] Lyman M. Fort, *Speech for All*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1945. vi+342 pp.

[14] L. S. Judson and E. M. Judson, *Modern Group Discussion*. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1937. 198 pp.

[15] A. Craig Baird, *Discussion—Principles and Types*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1943. x+348 pp.

[16] Henry L. Ewbank and J. Jeffery Auer, *Discussion and Debate*. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1941. xii+524 pp.

[17] James H. McBurney and Kenneth Hance, *Principles and Methods of Discussion*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939. viii+452 pp.

school text material on debating. Two of the most usable of these sources are by Summers and Whan,[18] and O'Neill and Cortright.[19] Some mention must be made here of the study of parliamentary procedure. The student of public speaking ought to know *Robert's Rules of Order*,[20] and a handy reference guide such as the manual by Auer.[21] Some useful references on some aspects of the teaching of public speaking will be found in the section on Extra-Curricular Activities.

4. Secondary school instruction in theatre is carried out in both course and extra-curricular programs. We shall discuss the extra-curricular program in a later section by that title. The American Educational Theatre Association has published a *Syllabus for a Proposed Course in Dramatics at the High School Level*.[22] This organization has also prepared a Special Theatre Issue of the *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*,[22] with articles on educational dramatics by fifty-six specialists in the field. The official magazine of this professional organization, *Educational Theatre Journal*,[22] began publication in October, 1949, with a stimulating series of articles.

Two texts widely used for high school courses in dramatics are the books by Mather, Spaulding, and Skillen,[23] and Ommanney.[24] The handbook by Davis[25] is another source which works well as a text for such a course. Ward's book on *Playmaking with Children*[26] is a superior source for materials on creative dramatics from the kindergarten through high school. The teacher who is interested in the problems of integration of instruction in dramatics with other subjects will find Hubbard's book on the *Teaching of History through Dramatic Presentation*[27] suggestive.

5. The teacher of speech is often called upon to offer some instruction in radio. While most of this instruction is focused on radio listening, some of it is concerned with the production of radio programs. Both approaches to the subject serve primarily the general educational development of the student. Two recent books on educational radio by Woelfel and Tyler,[28] and Levenson[29] serve as excellent background instruction in this area. The monograph by Lowdermilk[30] presents practical suggestions on the types of equipment to be considered. Callahan's[31] book is primarily concerned

[18] Harrison B. Summers and Forest Whan, *How to Debate*. The H. W. Wilson Company, 1941, 336 pp.

[19] James M. O'Neill and Rupert L. Cortright, *Debate and Oral Discussion*. The Century Company, 1931, xi+273 pp.

[20] H. M. Robert, *Rules of Order*. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1915, 323 pp.

[21] J. Jeffery Auer, *Essentials of Parliamentary Procedure*. New York: F. S. Crofts and Company, 1940, x+33 pp.

[22] For further information about these materials the reader should correspond with the American Educational Theatre Association, Speech Department, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

[23] Charles C. Mather, Alice H. Spaulding, and Melita H. Skillen, *Behind the Footlights*. New York: Silver, Burdett and Company, 1935, xii+495 pp.

[24] Katherine Anne Ommanney, *The Stage and the School*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939, xix+504 pp.

[25] Eugene C. Davis, *Amateur Theatre Handbook*. New York: Greenberg, 1945, xv+227 pp.

[26] Winifred Ward, *Playmaking with Children*. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1947, xiv+312 pp.

[27] Eleanore Hubbard, *The Teaching of History through Dramatic Presentation*. Chicago: Benjamin H. Sanborn and Company, 1935, xi+447 pp.

[28] Norman Woelfel and I. Keith Tyler, editors, *Radio and the School*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, New York: World Book Company, 1945, ix+385 pp.

[29] William B. Levenson, *Teaching through Radio*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart, Inc., 1945, x+474 pp.

[30] R. R. Lowdermilk, *The School Radio Sound System*. Washington, D. C.: The Federal Radio Education Committee, Federal Security Agency, 1941, 58 pp.

with school production problems. The teacher of speech who is charged with the responsibility of putting on school broadcasts will find the book useful in accomplishing this objective and of doing much in the way of speech education at the same time.

6. How should we handle the speech correction problem in the high school? The best answer to this question probably lies in the extensive literature on speech correction programs in the public schools. The speech correctionist usually works with all cases from the kindergarten through the high school. The high school teacher will find her speech and hearing problems pretty well covered by Backus,[32] Johnson and others,[33] and Ainsworth.[34] The serious student of these problems will also want to make use of the volumes of *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*,[35] and the publications of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Illinois. Many useful articles may be found in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, and the bulletins of The National Association of Secondary School Principals referred to earlier in this review.

7. The program of extra-curricular activities in speech has long contributed successfully to the objectives of instruction in speech education. Although there is no defense for the extreme practices of misguided zealots who sometimes get temporary direction of these activities, the values to be derived from well-conducted programs should not be handicapped by holding the exceptions to be the rule. The best programs ordinarily are those which are founded in a well-organized curricular course of study and are guided by a balanced philosophy of the educational functions to be served. For a better understanding of such a philosophy the teacher should consider the statements by Bedichek and Winship,[36] and Murphy.[37]

The teacher who wants some good advice on debating will find what he needs in Lahman's *Debate Coaching*.[38] This and other problems of the director of forensics are taken up in books by Holm,[39] Melzer,[40] and Quimby.[41] The publications of the National University Extension Association[42] provide standard reference sources for the subject selected in most states for the debate question each year. Most states which have extensive activity programs have an organization with some such title as The [State] Speech Activities Association. The directors of such organizations are equipped to provide suggestive materials on both content for speech, reading, or play pro-

[31] Jennie W. Callahan, *Radio Workshop for Children*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1948, 398 pp.

[32] Ollie L. Backus, *Speech in Education*. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1943. xv+358 pp.

[33] Wendell Johnson and others, *Speech Handicapped School Children*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948, xiii+464 pp.

[34] Stanley Ainsworth, *Speech Correction Methods*. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1948, xi+149 pp.

[35] *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*. 1936-, American Speech and Hearing Association, Wayne University, Detroit, Michigan.

[36] Roy Bedichek and F. L. Winship, *The Speech Teacher and Competition*. Austin: The University of Texas Publication, No. 4142, November 8, 1949, 131 pp.

[37] Richard Murphy, The Forensic Mind, in *Studies in Speech and Drama*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1944, pp. 451-472.

[38] C. P. Lahman, *Debate Coaching*. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1936, 428 pp.

[39] J. N. Holm, *How to Judge Speech Contests*. Portland, Maine: Platform New Publishing Company, 1938, xi+225 pp.

[40] A. E. Melzer, *High School Forensics*. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1940, 156 pp.

[41] Brooks Quimby, *So You Want to Debate* and *So You Are Directing Debate*. Portland, Maine: J. Weston Walch, 1948, 154 pp.; 151+xlii pp.

[42] Bower Aly, editor, *The N.U.E.A. Handbook*, Columbia, Missouri: The Artcraft Press, 1949.

duction, and procedure in conducting these activities. The director of forensics will find the *Speech Activities*[43] magazine of help in the direction of various types of speech activities.

Dramatics,[44] the official organ of The National Thespians Society, and Players Magazine[45] are helpful sources of material for the busy director of a high school play. The National Thespians Society also publish a number of monographs which bring together some of their many series of articles on the processes of staging the play.[46] Some local college drama services are doing an excellent piece of work in advising teachers and community directors on their problems in play production.[47] The best single reference on play festivals is the monograph by Kramer.[48] One of the Bulletins of the National Association of Secondary School Principals is an excellent source for ideas on the assembly program.[49]

8. The teacher of speech should be informed on the place of speech in the curriculum and the procedures for curriculum making. Douglas's *The High School Curriculum*[50] and Leonard's *Developing the Secondary School Curriculum*[51] provide extensive background information on the ways of the curriculum maker. The chapter in the Douglas book by Pooley on English and Speech in the Curriculum provides a pretty good example of what happens to speech when left in the hands of the typical English teacher. Of the twenty-three pages in the chapter about one page is devoted to the consideration of speech. The chapter in the book by Deboer[52] is more systematic in its treatment of these matters. Alberty,[53] and Mudd[54] have concerned themselves particularly with curriculum making procedures for a core or integrated program. Stratemeyer, Forkner, and McKim[55] have outlined some 'Persistent Life Situations as Learners Face Them,' and listed a total of 174 specific areas of learning under these situations. Some 138 of these areas or seventy-nine per cent involve one or more types of speech activity. The person who knows the modern speech curriculum will find no difficulty in demonstrating the function of speech instruction in developing these objectives.

Several state speech teachers associations and a number of state departments of public instruction have developed courses of study. Some of the more notable of these teacher association products have been developed in Michigan, Texas, and Washington. Other state associations develop such

[43] *Speech Activities*, Egbert R. Nichols, editor. The Nichols Publishing House, 814 Campus Avenue, Redlands, California.

[44] Published by The National Thespians Society, College Hill Station, Cincinnati 24, Ohio.

[45] Published by Players Magazine, 122 East Second Street, Plainfield, N. J.

[46] See address in footnote number 44 above.

[47] See for example *Community Drama News*, Published by The Community Drama Service, Harold B. Obee, Director, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

[48] Magdalene Kramer, *Dramatic Tournaments in the Secondary Schools*. Columbia University, New York: Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 685, 1936.

[49] C. C. Harvey, editor, *The Assembly Program in the Secondary School*. The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary Schools, 30: No. 141, November 1948, 227 pp.

[50] Hail R. Douglas, editor, *The High School Curriculum*, New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1947, viii+661 pp.

[51] J. Paul Leonard, *Developing the Secondary School Curriculum*. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1946, xi+560 pp.

[52] John J. DeBoer, editor, *The Subject Fields in General Education*. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1941. Chapter IV.

[53] Harold Alberty, *Reorganizing the High School Curriculum*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947, x+458 pp.

[54] Dorothy Mudd, *A Core Program Grows*. Bel Air, Maryland: Board of Education of Harford County, 1949, vi+138 pp.

[55] F. B. Stratemeyer, H. L. Forkner, and M. G. McKim, *Developing A Curriculum for Modern Living*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947, xiii+558 pp.

materials from time to time. Availability of such materials may be determined by correspondence with the presidents of the teachers organizations in the several states.[56] State departments of public instruction which have developed substantial resource materials for their speech teachers within the last few years include Iowa, Texas, Louisiana, and Missouri. These materials may be secured through the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Several extensive studies of state programs of speech education are now under way. Reports of these studies[57] should be available in the near future to help bring into clearer focus some of the practical problems of curriculum construction for secondary school speech education.

9. We can no longer accept the assumption that anyone who knows his subject matter can teach it. The teachers of speech must accept the idea that teaching can be improved. The first step in the improvement of teaching is to understand the psychology of learning well enough to make effective adaptations of its principles to the business of teaching. For a reveiw of these general principles one should take time to give a pretty thorough consideration to books such as those by Woodruff,[58] and Stroud.[59] Since we teach children as well as courses we can well find The American Council on Education's *Helping Teachers Understand Children*[60] a useful book to know. The study of speech as a form of social behavior demands consideration of student personalities. I have found both Symond's *Mental Hygiene of the School Child*[61] and Strang's *The Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work*[62] practical aids in understanding these problems. The new book by Wright on *Group Guidance*[63] makes further contribution to this aspect of our teaching. An illustration of the high frequency feeling of need for instruction in this area comes to us from the study of Elias[64] who reports 'Being able to talk to people' as the most common personal problem of the high school students he surveyed.

Teachers interested in improving their instruction are giving consideration to at least two other aspects of their work: audio-visual aids, and testing and evaluation. The progressive speech teacher should derive benefit from study of such a book as Dale's *Audio-Visual Methods in Teaching*.[65] Buell Whitehill[66] has compiled a list of films which may be used

[56] For the names and addresses of these persons see *The Directory* of the Speech Association of America, published annually at Columbia, Missouri: The University of Missouri.

[57] For further information about these studies in the indicated states write Haden K. Carruth, Department of Speech, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan; Waldo W. Woodson, Department of Speech, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California; Franklin H. Knower, Department of Speech, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio; Ralph C. Lawson, Department of Speech, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana; and Jack E. Douglas, Department of Speech, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.

[58] Asahel D. Woodruff, *The Psychology of Teaching*. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1948. xi+272 pp.

[59] James B. Stroud, *Psychology in Education*. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1946. vi+664 pp.

[60] Commission on Teacher Education, *Helping Teachers Understand Children*. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1945. xv+168pp.

[61] P. M. Symonds, *The Mental Hygiene of the School Child*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1934. xi+321 pp.

[62] Ruth Strang, *The Role of the Teacher in Personnel Work*. Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935. xiii+417 pp.

[63] Barbara H. Wright, *Practical Handbook for Group Guidance*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1948. vi+225 pp.

[64] L. J. Elias, *High School Youth Look at Their Problems*. Pullman, Washington: The College Book Store, 1949. p. 34.

[65] Edgar Dale, *Audio-Visual Methods in Teaching*. New York: The Dryden Press, 1946. xviii+546.

[66] Buell Whitehill, Jr., 16mm Sound and Silent Films for Use in the Teaching of Speech. Pittsburgh: Department of Speech, University of Pittsburgh. [n.d.] 9 pp.

in teaching speech. A practical guide to better testing practice may be found in Adkins' *Construction and Analysis of Achievement Tests.*[67]

10. Some general references of value to all our teachers of speech include the Thonssen and Fatherson *Bibliography of Speech Education,*[68] the *Publications List of the National Educational Association,*[69] the catalogue of *Publications of the American Council on Education,*[70] and the issues of the *Review of Educational Research*[71] for its last three year cycle. The sections on education in the Dow collection of thesis abstracts,[72] and the Knower index to graduate theses in the field of speech and drama[73] should help the student to know the developmental history and to keep some tab on the ever expanding literature of the field.

In setting up this review we faced the alternatives of writing more intensively about some of the parts or suggestively about several parts or areas of the literature. The latter course has been followed not only to avoid misrepresentation of the part for the whole, but to enable us in seeing the whole, to see more clearly the work to be done.

FRANKLIN H. KNOWER,
The Ohio State University

JOHN C. CALHOUN, NULLIFIER, 1829-39. By Charles M. Wiltse. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1949; pp. 511. $6.00.

In the second volume of his projected trilogy Mr. Wiltse continues his careful and thorough study of the life of South Carolina's most famous son. *John C. Calhoun, Nationalist* (Indianapolis, 1944) brought the Calhoun story through the tariff debates of 1828. The present volume concludes with the Democratic party's capitulation to the states' rights doctrine.

In his first volume Mr. Wiltse explored Calhoun's 'War Hawk' period and the forces which finally brought forth his *South Carolina Exposition and Protest.* The present work examines the motivations and the processes by which Calhoun, driven as always by an inner need for a comprehensive logic, developed a complete rationalization on which to rest his defense of Southern agrarianism and slavery.

John C. Calhoun, Nullifier, should prove valuable to students of American public address for it is, in a sense, a case study in rhetorical invention. It is a narrative biography depicting in fine and accurate detail the steps by which Calhoun expanded and perfected his philosophical premises to meet the changing exigencies of political strategy and argument. The author is able to show, for example, that as early as 1830 Calhoun and his friends were expressing among themselves the conviction that nullification could be made an instrument for the defense of slavery as well as a weapon by which the protective tariff might be defeated. Mr. Wiltse thus makes it clear that no study of the nullification debates can safely ignore the importance of the slavery question as a topic affecting the invention of arguments. The author's careful researches also bring to the fore the difficult rhetorical problems which Calhoun and his friends faced in their efforts to propagate the nullification doctrine without encouraging secession or armed insurrection on the one hand or justifying the easy charges of treason on the other. Mr. Wiltse is not a rhetorical critic, but his books provide much grist for the critic's mill.

Calhoun, says his biographer, was the 'champion of individual liberty and of minority interests against the arbitrary power of the majority,' but the liberty and the interests he

[67] Dorothy C. Adkins, *Construction and Analysis of Achievement Tests.* Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947, xvii+292 pp.

[68] Lester Thonssen and Elizabeth Fatherson, *Bibliography of Speech Education.* New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1939, 800 pp.

[69] *Publication List of the National Education Association.* Washington 6, D. C.: National Education Association of the United States, 1949, 30 pp.

[70] *Publications of the American Council on Education.* Washington, D. C.: The American Council on Education, 1949, 55 pp.

[71] *Review of Educational Research.* Washington, D. C.: American Educational Research Association. [Publishes six issues a year devoted to research reported in the literature.]

[72] Clyde W. Dow, Abstracts of Theses in the Field of Speech and Drama—IV, *Speech Monographs,* 16: No. 2. 289-363, 1949. [See other volumes for additional abstracts.]

[73] Franklin H. Knower, Graduate Theses—An Index to Graduate Work in Speech and Drama—XVI, *Speech Monographs,* 16: No. 2. 364-380, 1949. [See other volumes for additional indexes.]

championed were, as Mr. Wiltse agrees, economic rather than humanitarian. The evidence presented in this biography shows that Calhoun's aristocratic social views and the economic interests of the South fathered his political doctrines, even though the biographer seems to glide over this ordering of events when he writes:

> For a decade he had been following a course charted by his own political philosophy, perhaps without fully realizing the implications of what he did, and he now arrived at the predestined end. He had developed a doctrine in terms of which he could logically defend the vested interest of a minority. . . .

Mr. Wiltse's conclusion would rest more easily upon his evidence had he substituted 'social philosophy' for 'political philosophy.'

In so far as the work has serious weaknesses they are that moral and political integrity seem too exclusively the possessions of Calhoun and his friends and that the biographer's judgments are sometimes colored by his admiration for Calhoun's great strength of character. In the present volume, as in *John C. Calhoun, Nationalist*, the central figure stands alone with his principles, struggling against a nation of shifty, drifting, political opportunists. Such an exclusively Calhoun's-eye view of men and issues makes it difficult to assess the subject's true importance. Moreover, when he views the scene thus narrowly, it is difficult for the author to escape the charge of bias. Mr. Wiltse makes determined efforts to appraise his subject objectively in spite of the sympathy he feels for Calhoun's personal qualities; but because he cannot extend to other political figures the same sympathetic understanding, perfectly balanced judgments emerge too seldom. Thus it is that although the author frankly admits that Calhoun contrived political doctrines to suit his social and economic preferences, similar behavior is made to seem an act of connivance or sycophancy in Clay, Webster, Benton, Jackson, Van Buren, and others. Mr. Wiltse paints the political scene as it appeared from the vantage ground of Fort Hill; the master of the manor is portrayed in superb detail, but his compatriots, seen only from a distance, are represented as disproportionately small, sometimes disfigured beings.

It is regrettable that the publisher of this and of Mr. Wiltse's earlier study of Calhoun did not see fit to issue the two works as matching volumes, even though either may be read as an independent work. It is also surprising that the present volume contains no clear and prominent statement that a companion piece exists.

Calhoun, Nullifier, like the earlier work, is based upon extensive original research and is well written, carefully documented, and satisfactorily indexed.

CARROLL C. ARNOLD,
Cornell University

F. D. R. MY BOSS. By Grace Tully. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949: pp. xiii+372. $3.50.

For more than sixteen years Grace Tully served Franklin D. Roosevelt as a secretary. Beginning in 1928 with the campaign for the governorship of New York and through all the years spent by Mr. Roosevent in the White House, she took dictation from him, typed drafts of his speeches, and handled countless details. Without benefit of a diary (but with occasional references to official files), she has now brought together stories, anecdotes, and personal reminiscences to add to the rapidly growing number of documents concerning the late President.

Though Miss Tully's book is not deeply analytical or penetrating, some formal recitation of history is incorporated into the informal recounting of events and impressions. Many items of importance to historians and rhetoricians can be gleaned from its chatty pages.

Chapter 5, Let the People Know, consists of fifteen pages which explain more fully and clearly than any other widely read, authoritative source Roosevelt's general methods of speech preparation, his frequent ad libbing during prepared addresses, his attitudes toward his audiences, and his confidence in his ability to take his problems 'to the people.' Grace Tully has come through her years of detailed work in typing and re-typing as many as twelve drafts of a single address with a profound respect for the art of speech-making. She also comments on such interesting details as Roosevelt's ability to vary his normal speaking rate of one hundred words a minute by increasing or decreasing his pace, if his time began 'to run badly' because of impromptu variations from the manuscript. The little known fact that he had a bridge for a separation between two of his lower front teeth, which he disliked wearing, but which eliminated a slight whistle effect, is a detail of interest.

The late President's secretary emphatically confirms the opinion of most responsible commentators that with F. D. R. rested the ulti-

mate, sole responsibility for his addresses and for his official acts. Although Roosevelt sought and received advice from many individuals and sources, it was he who made the final decisions. He was neither the victim nor the tool of figures surrounding him.

The well-known war message of 8 December 1941 was delivered almost exactly as Roosevelt originally dictated it. Miss Tully remembers that 'he spoke each word incisively and slowly, carefully specifying each punctuation mark and paragraph.' He dictated 'without hesitation, interruption, or second thoughts.'

Other equally interesting and significant references to specific speeches appear throughout the book. Even when the author makes such a comment as, 'His [fourth] inaugural address was a brief one on which Bob Sherwood did considerable work,' she makes clear that Roosevelt's willingness to accept materials, ideas, and language from others does not indicate a lack of concern or control over his speech-making. Suggestions made to him were rarely accepted in toto. Never were they used unless they fit Mr. Roosevelt's desired framework of ideas and style.

A chapter of especial interest to students of Roosevelt's speaking is entitled Friends in Deed. Miss Tully presents her impressions of most of the well-known advisers who occupied the stage for a time with Mr. Roosevelt. These sketches, probably more than any other major segment of the book, reveal Miss Tully's intense loyalty to her 'boss.' Her firsthand observations are valuable contributions to our total knowledge, even though for the most part she simply lauds these personages to whatever degree she has judged the value of their help to Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The author's evaluation of the effect of the famous 'quarantine' address in Chicago, 5 October 1937, also mirrors her loyalty rather than an objective picture of the public's reaction Her belief that he received a 'splendid reaction,' that newspaper comments, except for a few 'anti-Roosevelt papers' such as the 'Chicago *Tribune*,' hailed the address as a 'turning point in world history' unfortunately was not the case. Actually, the wave of protest from peace-loving Americans which followed the speech so worried Roosevelt and his advisers that he did not use such strong language again for many months.

If this book is read as a collection of reminiscences by a devoted employee who did her job with unwavering loyalty and disregard for her own personal conveniences, the reader will have an enjoyable and profitable experience. Probably no final, definitive answers to any of the perplexing questions concerning Franklin D. Roosevelt can be found here. But surely this work will be of much help to rhetoricians and historians. Of all the books now available on the late President, this more than any other (with the possible exception of Robert Sherwood's *Roosevelt and Hopkins*) provides worthwhile information for students of Roosevelt the speaker.

EARNEST BRANDENBURG,
Washington University

THE PEOPLE SHALL JUDGE. Readings in the Formation of American Policy. Selected and edited by The Staff, Social Sciences 1, The College of the University of Chicago. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949. 2 volumes; pp. xvi+797; xiv+931; $4.50 each volume.

THE HARVARD READING LIST IN AMERICAN HISTORY. Edited by Kenneth B. Murdock, Chairman, John M. Gaus, Howard M. Jones, Frederick Merk, and Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949; pp. 22. 50c.

For some years the University of Chicago has been experimenting with a collection of readings in mimeographed form for students in the first course in a three-year sequence of general social science courses. The two volumes, now in book form under the title *The People Shall Judge*, contain excerpts or full texts from more than 250 important writings and documents. They are meant for use in 'Social Sciences 1.' They will also find use in a circle much wider than the classroom. They deserve to be included in that small library of books the student does not sell once the final examination is over.

As the editors announce, the volumes consist of selections which might be described as ideas about a public policy. They are taken from

> systematic philosophies; from opinions crystallized in law and judicial decisions; from speeches or pamphlets struck off in the heat of controversy; from political and diplomatic correspondence; from sermons, lectures, and newspapers. They range from the speculative to the practical, from the nature of man and society to specific issues of political, economic, and social policy in domestic and foreign affairs.

For the student and teacher of rhetoric and public address these books provide a treasure trove of immense value. Almost half of the

selections comprise speeches, court opinions, lectures, sermons, debates, or documents which were composed directly following public discussion or legislative action. The impression that public address has been a powerful instrument in molding our national character and our ideas about government is inescapable. The editors have carefully grouped the readings to force our attention upon the persistent problems of liberty, equality, and security during a dozen or more significant eras of American history.

The student of American public address can find within these pages a veritable outline history of the great American speakers—John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, Henry Clay, Andrew Jackson, Ralph Waldo Emerson, John C. Calhoun, Daniel Webster, Abraham Lincoln, Stephen A. Douglas, Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, William Jennings Bryan, Robert LaFollette, George W. Norris, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and many others. Among recent speakers and writers, we find Herbert Hoover, Norman Thomas, Robert A. Taft, Harry S. Truman, Henry A. Wallace, Wendell L. Willkie, Robert M. Hutchins, and Dean Acheson.

Since other critics will comment on features of *The People Shall Judge* that relate to its use as a classroom resource-text, this review will center about matters of concern to the historian of rhetorical criticism. If this seems unfair let it be said that the rhetorical critic is interested *inter alia* in the effect of the public utterance. This involves a study of the events leading up to the address, the immediate setting, the issues raised, their development, the style of the speech and the speaker, and finally, the immediate reaction and the longer-term effects. It is perhaps too much to hope for a treatment of all these factors in the unit introductions and headnotes to the individual selections of this text. A well qualified teacher may supply some of them by lecture. It is a mistake to neglect them, however, and then expect the student to gain the full significance of the selection by reading the text alone. To illustrate—some twenty pages are devoted to excerpts from the Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858. The editors' note of about a page is much too concise to be helpful. The same may be said of the notes preceding the Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 (20 pages), the Debates in the New York Constitutional Convention of 1821 (7 pages), Henry Clay on 'The American System' (10 pages), Daniel Webster's Second Reply to Hayne (11 pages), and the selections dealing with the rejection of the League of Nations (35 pages).

To those who may insist that the student of the Social Sciences is interested only in the ideas expressed in the selections themselves we say that if he is 'to develop competence in the analysis of social issues by giving special [attention and] prominence to the process of deliberation and decision through which policy is formulated'—one of the aims of the Social Sciences Staff—he needs better guidance than this anthology now provides.

What else would improve it? A detailed index (none is included); fuller biographical details (e.g. John Winthrop, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Robert A. Taft); a chronology of events; a reference list following each unit (See *The Harvard Reading List in American History*); study questions designed to relate the readings one to another (a few to illustrate method are found on p. ix of the Introduction to volume two).

Chancellor Hutchins has said that 'no case book is a great book.' But here we have a notable exception because of the importance of the *great* readings it contains and because of the utility of having them so well chosen and arranged.

In his 1935-36 report President Conant of Harvard said that it seemed to him possible

> that in the study of our national cultural history we may find the principle that is needed to unify our liberal arts tradition and to mold it to suit our modern age. A true appreciation of this country's past might be the common denominator among educated men, which would enable them to face the future united and unafraid.

The Harvard Reading List in American History is the work of an editorial committee headed by Professor Kenneth B. Murdock and

> is not intended for students now taking regular instruction in our universities in American history, literature, or culture. It is meant for others such as university students concentrating in other fields, college alumni, or the general public.

The list of titles (about 300) is divided into three parts: An easy Introduction to General Aspects of American Development, An Introduction to Specific Aspects of American Life and Thought, and Special Topics in American Historical Development. In this last part we find selections devoted to the Colonial Period, the Revolution, the Civil War, Nineteenth-Century Reform Movements, and other specialties.

This little book provides the key for further study to the selections of *The People Shall Judge*. In the hands of teachers trained in modern discussion methods (not one-sided lecturers and writers of quiz questions) and inquiring students (not mere note-scribblers and writers of term papers) surely some genuine thinking should develop from the use of the Chicago selections and the *Harvard Reading List*. They should do much to advance President Conant's wise suggestion.

H.F.H.

THE ART OF READABLE WRITING. By Rudolf Flesch. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949; pp. xiv+237. $3.00.

This is an irritating book.

It is hard to distinguish it from *The Art of Plain Talk*, an earlier book by the same author. Franklin H. Knower in his review of that book in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, was quite right when he said its purpose was 'to provide instruction in practical writing.' This is also a book on practical writing—writing that can be read with ease and pleasure. Mr. Flesch says the new book is a 'scientific rhetoric,' but he does not define *scientific*, and *rhetoric* to him is merely the art of using words. There is a new readability formula (a double-headed one) in the new book, but it does not seem to be more scientific than the one in the older book. Mr. Flesch says the new book is not a rehash or a sequel, that it does not overlap but is complementary to the older book. It seems, then, that Mr. Flesch merely has more to say on the topics of practical writing and has some different angles on that subject, including two new yardsticks to measure readability.

I am annoyed with Chapter 1 on You and Aristotle. I would like to say to Mr. Flesch:

I don't like the rules and principles of writing you mention any more than you do. I also approve of Sponberg's experimental study of climax and anti-climax order (SM 13: 35-44). It merely confirmed, as Sponberg says in his article, principles set forth in some textbooks in rhetoric and speech at that time.

But why do you blame Aristotle for all the pedantry you complain of? Was he really the first to think of parts of speech? Where in his *Rhetoric* does he say that 'all non-fiction consisted of three kinds of speeches—"deliberative, forensic, and epideictic"'? What evidence is there that he preferred the climactic to the anti-climactic order? What do you make of his preference for a two-part arrangement—statement and proof? Or of his emphasis on metaphor, on vividness and liveliness in language? Have you considered his constant use of the yardstick of the effect on the audience, his highly functional treatment of style and other parts of rhetoric?

Finally, why do you think that Aristotle influenced the other Greek and the Latin teachers and writers of grammars and rhetorics? Have you thought that Latin writers, and English writers following them, and not Aristotle and his followers, have laid the dead hand of pedantry upon the rules for writing?

I am pleased to note that Mr. Flesch has read Sponberg's study in *Speech Monographs* and another in the same journal (Ehrensberger's, SM 12: 94-111). But I wish he had acted on a hint given him by Knower in the review in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH earlier cited. I would like to know the bases of validity and reliability of his new formulas. I do not think it enough for him to refer to the literature on the subject. I wish he had explained it plainly in his Notes—especially why he thinks the new formulas are preferable to the old.

'And now let's get down to brass tacks,' in the words of the first sentence of Chapter 13. This chapter sums up the book fairly well.

If you face a bread-and-butter job of writing (that is, if you must write something that will be read by masses of people and will have the effect on them you or your boss desires), here's what you should do:

1. Find out all you can about your prospective readers. Talk to them, poll them, really get to know what they know, don't know, *want* to know.

2. Collect your information. Include color and human interest material.

3. Stop a bit. Sleep on it. Give your subsconscious a chance to work on the problem and the material.

4. Find an 'angle'; settle on 'plot' or basic structure.

5. Start the piece with something interesting and promising and in correct chronological order. (I had a hard time with this one, Mr. Flesch; Chapter 6 needs a little of that despised 'unity'—or at least consistency.)

6. Include plenty of narrative and good dialogue. Put in live people; say 'you,' and 'we.'

7. Shorten your sentences and words. You'll have to use some long sentences and words. Avoid complex sentences, affixes,

heavy prepositions and connectives, auxiliary verbs, and too many adjectives.

8. Don't worry about grammar. Use contractions. Remember that sometimes a preposition is a good word to end a sentence with. As for infinitives—when in doubt, split 'em!

9. Test your own and others' writing for readibility—case and human interest—by the famous Flesch formula. But don't expect the use of the formula alone to produce results. It is only a rough gauge at best, no magic wand.

These principles fairly well sum up the book. What do they add up to? How sound are they? What use are they?

That's what irritates me most. I would say that I fear my oxen are gored, if I had not been impressed by Mr. Flesch's main principle: most of my readers wouldn't know what I meant. What I mean is that I'm afraid I have a lot to learn about writing.

There's a lot of nonsense in this book. But most of it does not touch the main issues. It is distressing for it casts suspicion on the leading ideas. But the main principles are no doubt sound and important—if you want to write so that almost anyone can understand and read with interest; students who read our textbooks, for example.

Anyone in our field, at least anyone in rhetoric and public address, knows the changes in the principles of effective speaking in the last forty years. In general, these changes have resulted from the testing of some of our traditional and often pedantic rules by experimentation, and by applying the laws of psychology to them. That is what Mr. Flesch, among others, is doing in the field of writing—writing for the masses, 'bread-and-butter' writing.

Now I would like to know how to write for educated readers without insulting their intelligence. And how to write concisely as well as plainly. That would make a good book—and a different one, Mr. Flesch!

RUSSELL H. WAGNER,
University of Virginia

LANGUAGE . . . MAN . . . SOCIETY. Readings in Communication. Edited by Harold E. Briggs. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1949; pp. xv+707. $3.50.

MASS COMMUNICATIONS. A Book of Readings Selected and Edited for the Institute of Communications Research in the University of Illinois by the Director of the Institute, Wilbur Schramm. Urbana: The University of Illinois Press, 1949; pp. xi+552. $4.50.

Those two books of readings deal with similar aspects of communication but they are pitched at different levels. Professor Briggs has prepared a volume of readings for freshmen while Professor Schramm is concerned with more advanced students.

Language . . . Man . . . Society is predicated on the thesis that since communication, both mass and inter-personal, greatly affects our lives, it is worth while to become aware of the processes involved in communication. 'It is desirable,' writes Professor Briggs, 'that we should acquire a technique for analyzing these processes, form a proper ideal of the purposes for which they ought to be used, and develop our abilities to use them.' The place for such training he assigns to the freshman English course. The various aspects of communication are treated more or less cursorily in excerpts from printed or spoken material in nine sections: Language and Childhood, Language and Thought, Semantics Pro and Con, The Law and Lawyers, Science, Literature and the Arts, Media of Communication, Radio Productions, and TVA—Arguments Pro and Con. The selections from the more than fifty authors range from two pages of Otto Jespersen to sixty pages of David Lilienthal. Semantics is debated by Havakawa, Chase, Dunham, and Schlauch. The language of science is discussed and exemplified by the writings of Einstein, Bridgman, Jacques Barzun, Wendell Johnson, and others. Literature and the Arts includes materials on aesthetics, painting, music, architecture, and poetry. Selections from popular and critical articles cover the press, radio, cinema, and books. Two University of Chicago round tables on communism and capitalism and MacLeish's 'The Fall of the City' comprise the section on radio productions. The case history of TVA, offered as an example of communication in action, includes newspaper cartoons on both sides of the controversy and verbatim excerpts from the proceedings and debates of the Eightieth Congress.

Such a broad survey as Professor Briggs has undertaken must inevitably take on the character of a potpourri, and superficiality is inescapable. Since poetry is a form of communication, Professor Briggs feels obliged to exemplify it and relate it to changing times and differing points of view. This he does by including one poem each from Keats, Browning, Auden, E. B. White, and MacLeish. The compiler states that his book offers models and techniques of writing everything from autobiography to definitions

and research papers, as well as information about the media of communication, cartoons, oral English, semantics, and a radio play. Such a grab-bag of materials is handy to have around, to be sure, but whether it, or the course for which it was designed, can ever hope to provide real insight and more than surface knowledge remains in the area of doubt.

Schramm's *Mass Communications* is a considerably more advanced collection of readings on the social, economic, political, and psychological aspects of mass communications. It is designed to meet part of the need for an 'integrated introduction to mass communications for persons who would like to study them through the windows of the social sciences.' Schramm has organized his readings around the now fairly conventional arrangement of channels, content, effects, and audiences. Excellent historical essays on the development of mass communications are reprinted from the works of Robert E. Park, Llewellyn White, Harold D. Lasswell, and Terry Ramsaye. Government and industry regulation are discussed philosophically and concretely, the codes of the movie, press, and radio associations being included. The process of communication is explained in papers by Wendell Johnson, Daniel Katz, Wilbur Schramm, Margaret Mead, and Cantril and Allport. The content of mass communications is indicated in excerpts from scholarly articles by Mott, Arnheim, Wolfenstein, and others. Lazarsfeld, Lippman, Berelson, and Wirth, among others, treat the effects of mass communications. A short appendix includes helpful facts and figures.

Schramm's collection has the virtue of clear organiation and a scrupulous reliance on scholarly writing that appeared originally in book or journal form. It is probably the most useful collection available for serious communications courses, since it reprints some of the better papers that appeared in the earlier symposia, Schramm's *Communications in Modern Society* and Bryson's *The Communication of Ideas*. Like the others, the present collection suffers from the failure to give adequate consideration to the individuals or groups that do the communicating. Would it not be of some value to know who are the most influential communicators in America today, to analyze their methods of operation, and to evaluate their work? Another drawback of this collection can be attributed not only to this volume, but to the general effort to link together all mass media. While it is true that they share common objectives and pose similar problems of public policy and responsibility, they also differ sharply in respect to history, techniques, and matters of regulation. It seems overly ambitious for one individual to attempt to become expert in all the media or for a single volume to hope to do more than skim the surface of this fascinating but enormous subject.

GIRAUD CHESTER,
Queens College

THE POLLS AND PUBLIC OPINION. The Iowa Conference on Attitude and Opinion Research Sponsored by the State University of Iowa. Edited by Norman C. Meier and Harold W. Saunders. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1949; pp. x+355. $2.50.

One purpose of this review is to object to the tone of an earlier review by Lindsay Rogers in *The New York Times*. The author of the *Pollsters* may have discouraged some potential readers of the Iowa Conference report by his disparagement of opinion measurement in general and the proceedings of this gathering in particular. According to Rogers, the only excuse for sponsoring the Conference was that 'the Hawkeye State is the mother of pollsters.' Any fair-minded person who reads the transcription can see that the occasion was more than an 'old-home week.' It is likely that serious students of objective measurement in social science research will find *The Polls and Public Opinion* a more useful work than *The Pollsters*.

Many of our readers will recall the news items that appeared during the Iowa Conference early in February 1949. According to the journalists, the pollsters were convening in search of an answer to the question, 'What hit us?' In fact, several professional papers of the Conference jokingly alluded to 'Black Tuesday,' the day Truman confounded the pollsters and millions of other persons. One of the seven parts of the Conference was indeed concerned with the disparity between the polls and the election. In this connection the preliminary report of the Social Science Research Council committee was discussed.

But much more than a 'licking of wounds' occurred. In Part One: Social Science Research we read of the role of the university in this field, some useful hints on basic research, and helpful advice on cooperative research. Part Two: Applied Social Science points out some present and future applications of the survey tools to marketing, mass communication, foreign policy, census and government, journalism, and law and the courts. As background material Part Three: The Determinants of Public Opinion is suggestive to speech teachers.

The contributors, representing the fields of sociology, journalism, and communications research, set out the determinants of opinion, some social and cultural factors, and the effects of pressure groups, communication media, and events upon opinion. The meeting on polls and election results has been mentioned above.

Part Five: The Future of Opinion Sampling begins with the interesting assertion that the public opinion poll is one of the most important social inventions since the secret ballot. It continues with the consideration of methodological problems related to 'call backs' in area sampling, question design, availability of respondents, interviewing, mathematical treatment of data, sampling of shifting universes, the nature of the opinion process, and the perennial debate on the area method vs the quota method. In answer to the question: 'Should political forecasts be made?' Seymour said 'yes'; Crossley said, 'Trends? Yes. Not forecasts'; Lazarsfeld made his 'yes' vote contingent upon the pollsters' contributing to basic research; Gallup said, 'Yes. I like to live dangerously.'

Unsettled problems and local surveys provide the subjects of the final papers in the symposium. Among the unsettled problems are the group dynamics of community life, the perfection of interviewing techniques, the process of problem-formulation, definition of attitudes, measurement of intensity, and other substantive, non-methodological matters.

A book of this sort would be more useful to teachers and students of speech if there were a substantial treatment of intensive measurement such as attitude scales and the like. However, this book has value as a reference, particularly in terms of the suggestions for research.

GLEN E. MILLS;
Northwestern University

DEMOCRACY THROUGH DISCUSSION. By Bruno Lasker. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1949; pp. xvii+376. $3.50.

In a highly complimentary foreword to Mr. Lasker's book, Eduard C. Lindeman of the New York School of Social Work raises a question which is as pertinent for a reviewer as for the author of a foreword: 'Why should this author have written this particular book at this special time?' One is inclined to agree with much of Lindeman's answer to the question. Lasker's long experience in the discussion field, and particularly his association with The Inquiry, qualifies him to write on discussion during a period in which myriad new currents roil the stream The Inquiry once had so neatly charted. And few would deny that the time is now for careful study and examination of the means by which democracy can be strengthened and preserved.

The work is divided into three parts by the author; actually there are four. After an opening survey of the historical place of discussion in the history of our republic, 'social thinking' is examined and defined. With a

> highly developed social science . . . we have given [relatively little] thought to the development of methods to accomplish joint purposes through the common deliberation and action of associated citizens. . . . We live together, in the main . . . without any apparatus to *create* unity of purpose.

The rest of Part 1 takes up, step by step, the procedures incident to the organization of democratically conducted discussions. This section is clear and helpful—in many ways a more interesting and useful description than that found in more formally organized textbooks.

Part 2 deals with the relation of group discussion to the thought process itself under the general heading of Discussion as Social Dynamic. In chapters dealing with Conflict and Character, Experience and Reality, Reflective Thinking and with Problems of Language, discussion is seen as the way to sounder conclusions as well as to finer social integration. Here one finds it most easy to take issue with Mr. Lasker. While he feels that 'too many of those who promote [discussion] still have not given up the idea that the competitive spirit is inevitable and must prevail,' he assumes that by learning to subsitute the 'multi-valued' for the 'two-valued' orientation it will in some way just as inevitably disappear. Questioning acceptance of authority on one page, he regrets our unwillingness to use the 'expert' in determining questions of public policy on another.

These are minor sources of concern, however. More serious is the assumption implicit in the entire section that there is a 'right' answer to problems discussed—an answer on which all who enter into discussion honestly and intelligently will agree. One may question both the validity and the value of this concept.

Reference is made in the author's preface to excellent supplementary works on accurate reasoning and on the use and misuse of language; in his briefer treatment Lasker attempts to create some realization of the problem of straight thinking. Certainly this realization should produce more orderly and intelligent dis-

cussion, whether or not agreement is the outcome.

The final section, A Reasonable Discussion Procedure, presents Lasker's attempt to weave a connected procedural design. He says:

> Experiments have shown that such a discussion must pass methodically from (a) a situation that gives concern, to (b) an analysis of the conflicting attitudes about it which are voiced or reported by members, hence to (c) a scrutiny of suggested ways of dealing with the situation, in (d) the light of circumstances or larger values not at once evident when the matter was first raised, and so if possible to (e) some final solution.

He does not suggest that the procedure be formally held to; flexibility and adaptability is always necessary. But to talk at random is certainly not the best approach. To get somewhere 'a discussion must pass through several stages the sequence of which is governed by both purpose and logic.'

The treatment of each of the steps in detail is clear and persuasive. Only on the last phase, Dynamic Agreement, does the author go from description and explanation to advocacy. Says he, 'If the course of the discussion has followed a rational thought process it should now be possible to reach a final agreement—or agreements.' True enough—if one includes as agreement the agreement to disagree!

Final pages, however, change the emphasis and stress the fact that there is no ideal, complete, or permanently true solution of any problem in human affairs. Thus unanimity on the solution is *not* essential! In fact Mr. Lasker even states that

> history and the findings of recent scientific studies alike point to the probability that wisdom is as often on the side of the few as on that of the many. All that can be said for the democratic process of weighing facts and opinions is that it greatly increases the probability of rational majority decisions.

Calling the exercise and the experience the profit, whatever the conclusion reached, the work ends. It is a disturbing note, if we are indeed to achieve democracy through discussion.

WARREN A. GUTHRIE,
Western Reserve University

CONFERENCE METHODS IN INDUSTRY. By Henry M. Busch. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949; pp. xii+104. $1.50.

At first glance, one supposes this book to be a primer in industrial conference methods, and hopes that here has been assembled in small compass the fundamentals of discussion as applied to the industrial rather than the academic or forum scene. As acknowledgment is made by the author to John Dewey, H. S. Elliott, and E. C. Lindeman, and descriptions of the scientist and scientific method are set forth, the imagination is fed. What is happening in extending democratic discussion methods in industry?

Some disillusion sets in, however, when the reader discovers the 'scientist' is 'poised, not excitable, hysterical or melancholy,' and 'executive, not haphazard.' Actually, the book turns out to be a personalized application of some well-known discussion and lecture techniques to topical industrial matters such as leadership, policy making, adjustment of conflicts, and education. It is, in the author's words, 'the deposit of twenty-five years of experience with all types of discussion groups and conferences.' Here and there appear very astute comments on human behavior, such as the sensitivity men have for their standing in their craft or profession, and how reluctant they are to expose themselves to correction. One of the later chapters gives pointers on conducting a panel, and there is a concluding chapter on spiritual values in connection with America's role of helping 'rebuild a broken world'—through the help of the conference method.

The personal nature of the book is seen in the absence of any tie-in with the now extensive library on conciliation, arbitration, and grievance machinery. The author's terminology and interpretations are quite his own. Conference is defined as 'consultation by a group of people with some expertness in the problems under consideration,' whereas 'discussion merely implies active interest and participation in the subject matter.' The author's example of his service as arbitrator, in which he conciliated the aggrieved, the union and management, by conferring with them separately to discover a 'formula' which all 'considered just,' ordinarily would be called not arbitration but mediation, and of a hazardous form. The recommendation that an arbitrator may 'cross-question individuals privately' is hardly standard procedure. Academics will not find universal the concept of a panel as a 'show,' nor accept as standard the advice that panel participants should 'speak in a conversational manner but in an oratorical tone [to] achieve desirable forensic results.' Precision of treatment is reserved for small matters. Not merely pencils should

be supplied, but 'sharp' ones; not merely scratch pads, but paper '8½x11'; not just a pitcher of water, but 'cold' water.

Disturbing in the book are two views. One is the consistently arbitrary role assigned to the leader; he is not guide but guardian. For example, the panel leader should explain to the members 'his idea of how the panel should be conducted and make clear precisely how he will operate and what he expects of participants.' In a 'problem-solving conference,' for purposes of education, some 'technical specialist' may give a 'carefully prepared talk,' after which 'it might be in order to have an eight or ten minute objective test to show how many important points the members retained.' Parliamentary procedures are advised against; the leader runs the meeting.

The second disturbing view is that worthy methods and ideas come primarily from management. A 'union representative' may be invited to 'sit in on conferences' occasionally to see the true method in operation; reciprocity is not suggested. Of the men in the field who are meeting in conference with company representatives, the author rather grudgingly observes, 'occasionally someone comes up with a better solution than that of the sales manager or the top salesman.'

In this book we have a blend of idealism, cooperation, and indirect salesmanship. If discussion methods are used for persuasive purposes, is it not fairer to regard them simply as devices, rather than to associate them directly with objectivity and democracy? When Earle Hannaford wrote his *Conference Leadership in Business and Industry*, he quite frankly described his method as one 'of shaping and guidance of people's thoughts and reactions,' the main purpose being to 'control the voluntary reactions of people.' Free, open discussion which terminates in policy must be distinguished from quasi-discussion, where conference techniques are used for control.

RICHARD MURPHY,
University of Illinois

INTRODUCTION TO FUNCTIONAL SEMANTICS. By Joseph G. Brin. With a Foreword by Maxwell H. Goldberg. Assisted by Lloyd S. FitzPatrick. Boston: The National Press Corporation. Tudor Book Division, 1949; pp. 201. $3.00.

The author—formerly a teacher of speech, now a professor of Semantics—offers a handbook for an elementary college course in English, composition, public speaking, communication, or whatever passes current in the curriculum as bearing upon the effort to teach the student something about words and their uses. The book neither offers, nor claims to offer, anything new in this endeavor. On the contrary, despite its modern title, it is a relatively conservative addition to a long tradition in composition and rhetoric. Ostensibly maintaining cousinhood with the Korzybskian principles of General Semantics, Brin's thesis, explanations, and practice-exercises are tempered by a wholesome regard for the needs of the student and by an equally wholesome respect for some of the traditions and practices of rhetoric.

The normative element common to many contemporary discussions of semantics is the general motif of the early lessons:

> The material that follows will serve as a guide to superior clarity in communication.
>
> Statement of Purpose,
> Ch. 1
>
> The general objective of cautious and precise use of language might well be to better intellectual, emotional and social adjustment.
>
> Introductory,
> Ch. 2
>
> Semantics on the functional or 'applied' level deals with MEANING of words in a particular context from the standpoint of their creation or avoidance of ambiguity and misunderstanding.
>
> Author's Thesis,
> Ch. 3

As the author's vehicle gets up steam, it moves rapidly toward the quicksands of normative construction:

> Where emphasis is placed upon the rhetorical approach to communication, less strict regard is given to the area of reference and the language of reality than is semantically desirable. . . . We would advocate what might be called a *pre-rhetorical* approach, that is to say, a pre-communicative consideration which conceives and organizes the trend of thought so that words are merely the method of conveying accurately the preconceived, well-thought-out idea.

These are slippery phrases, the ready understanding of which would probably be considerably enhanced by the personality of the author, whose lecture-notes these are. The meaning of 'pre-communicative' in this context suggests an intuitive approach to language-in-action that is a far cry from the tough, non-Aristotelian, cow,[3] multi-valued sort of thinking about thought that has come to be common

parlance with the General Semanticist. Somehow, in a manner unexplained, the student must be taught to pre-think a thought by some conveyance other than the use of words. 'The thought should be organized,' directs the author, 'before it is expressed.' What the author seems to be driving at is the ancient dictum about word-magic, perhaps inspired by a sneaking suspicion that 'the rhetorical approach to communication' is governed by all sorts of purposive predilections that are a bit immoral, verbally speaking. When men speak persuasively, they utilize 'words and phrases of vivid, connotative inference, usually of emotive implication.'

This sort of normative approach to words and thought and communication is highminded—in the twentieth-century sense—without question, but what qualifies it as a closer approach to reality than the give and take of the marts of persuasion slips the mind. The assumption must be that words and their ways are not the servants but the masters of men.

Once the author gets these General-Semantic directives out of his system, his presentation is almost archly conservative and classical. Discussed in order are: 'the effective word, the single word, words in unison, multiple meaning, vocabulary, dictionary definitions, the function of the dictionary, its limitations, connotation and denotation, euphemism, figures of speech, and two diversions on 'political parties' and 'the American language.' After a brief summary, the author presents seventy-seven pages of assorted materials for study and discussion, designed to give the student some experience in thinking and in criticizing. The general content of the book is, in short, a potpourri of comments, abjurations, questions, attitudes, and examples about words and their uses.

As a handbook of composition, the book is inadequate; as a handbook of rhetoric, it is incomplete; as a memento of what must be an interesting, enlivened course for Professor Brin's students, it is probably much more satisfactory than any notes they might themselves make. Those who are enthusiastic about the precepts of General Semantics in the name of linguistic morality can tee off from this textbook for long drives toward the distant green. Those who favor rhetorical study in a more moderate, descriptive fashion, will find much that is familiar, some that is cantankerous, and some that will be referred to the local 'How's That, Again? Department' for safekeeping. Communication, in the sense for which college courses are designed, is difficult to circumscribe in an elementary textbook.

WILLIAM G. HARDY,
Johns Hopkins University

INSTRUCTOR TRAINING MANUAL, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas: Command and General Staff College, 1949; pp. vi+150. $1.75.

The Command and General Staff College is the highest school of officer education within the Army and is charged with preparing officers for duty as commanders and staff officers at major levels. Instructors at the college are selected from the officer corps of the Army and prior to assuming their new duties are required to undergo a three weeks instructor-training course. The *Instructor Training Manual* provides a basic text for the course and a reference handbook for subsequent instructional guidance. The stated purpose of the *Manual* is to assemble in one volume the principles of learning, the principles and methods of instruction, and certain factual information concerning the college with which new instructors need to be familiar. To carry out this purpose the *Manual* has been divided into four parts.

Part one orients the students on matters pertaining to objectives, curriculum, facilities, and instructional methods. The chapter on instructional methods stresses the Army training doctrine of learning by doing. The new instructor finds that the principal vehicle for placing this concept of learning in effect is the map exercise. The exercise depicts on a map a military situation approximating one found under actual conditions and is the core around which are developed the skills, facts, and principles the learner is expected to master. The students are the doers in these exercises, with the instructor managing the activities and insuring that the aims of the lesson are realized.

Part two of the *Manual* devotes chapters to the application of the principles of learning, research, lesson planning, and instructional aids. The learning philosophy of the college is summed up in the statements that the most effective way of learning is by doing, efficient learning takes place when the student is ready to learn, and new learning is best acquired by building on what the student already knows. The chapter on instructional or visual aids, while emphasizing the importance of this type of support, properly points out that aids are not designed to replace the instructor, but to help him in his role of guiding the student learning. It cautions that an aid should not focus attention on itself but on the matter to be learned. The

capabilities and limitations of specific instructional aids are discussed, together with suggestions for the appropriate use of each.

Part three of the *Manual* concerns itself with the direction of learning activities. It contains chapters on oral presentation, map problems, the conference method of instruction, reviews, lectures, and demonstrations.

The chapter on oral presentation is a digest of the rules of speech applicable to oral methods, other than the lecture. Among topics included are: The speech qualifications of a good conference leader, the qualities of good speech, the qualities of delivery, and the language of speech. A speech analysis chart for the purpose of analyzing the speech characteristics of an instructor is also included in the chapter. This chart lists the various elements to be analyzed in a speech together with descriptive characteristics applicable to that element. For example, a speaker's 'articulation' would be assayed by circling one of the following descriptions, 'slurred,' 'mumbled,' 'over-precise,' 'distinct.' A paragraph details certain techniques which are stated to have wide application among able public speakers and lecturers. These techniques concern themselves with the proper use of illustrations, examples, quotations, contrasts, repetition, and means to gain audience attention. The chapter ends with a list of ways to improve one's speaking ability. It accents the thought that ideas, not words, should be memorized. It encourages recording the voice and obtaining the criticism and recommendations of a person trained in speech. Implementing the chapter are two appendices. One is an article by Harold F. Harding on The Principles of Poor Speaking which is reproduced from *The Scientific Monthly*, Volume LXVI, No. 1, January 1948. The other is by Harold A. Maxfield on Oral Presentation in Teaching which is reprinted from *U. S. Naval Training Bulletin*, April 1948. These articles are exceptionally effective and provide the flesh and blood to the skeletal outline of the chapter.

In the conference method of instruction we learn that the instructor's role is to guide and control the conference to insure that it achieves the stated purpose, to see that the authoritative doctrines and conclusions are fixed in the minds of the class, and to encourage maximum student participation. The chapter points out ways of stimulating or curtailing discussion, methods of shifting subjects, techniques for keeping the discussion on the subject, and securing extensive student participation. One paragraph is devoted to hints and suggestions on conducting a conference. It advises on conference manners, phrasing of questions, effect of pauses, and the appropriate form and style of speech. On the latter subject, we are told the conversational form is preferred and orations and lectures are to be shunned.

The *Manual* admirably fills the purpose for which it was written. Although designed for a specific group it should prove of much value to anyone concerned with instructor training or interested in the application of the teaching doctrine of the Army.

J. J. Holst,
Colonel, GSC
Headquarters Second Army

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES: 1948-49. Edited by A. Craig Baird. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1949: pp. 252. $1.50.

This, the twelfth annual volume in a series edited by Professor Baird, consists of an introduction titled How Shall We Judge the Thought or Ideas of a Speech?, the texts of the speeches with introductory notes, brief biographical sketches of the speakers, and a cumulative author index.

The introductory chapter on speech analysis is a significant contribution to the field of rhetorical criticism. Professor Baird outlines seventeen tests to be used in judging the thought or ideas of a speech. They are worth summarizing here: 1. Thought or ideas should be selected with reference to a specific audience. 2. The speech should have one central idea. 3. The central idea should be an important one. 4. The central idea is usually a synthesis of several subpropositions. 5. Ideas must be clearly defined. 6. The central idea should reflect a sound analysis of the subject. 7. Main and sub-ideas should be relevant to the central theme. 8. The ideas of the speech should have internal consistency. 9. Ideas should have originality. 10. Ideas often deal with problem solving. 11. The ideas should deal with causes and results. 12. Ideas in a speech often form a deductive chain of reasoning. 13. Main ideas should be supported by argument and evidence. 14. Ideas reflect the speaker's thinking and experience. 15. Ideas of a speech are integrated with the emotional and reflective thinking of the audience. 16. Speech ideas are judged by the impression they make on contemporary and later society. 17. Ideas are to be measured ultimately by their contribution to truth. Although this list is not exhaustive, it does include some of the more important tests that every speaker, amateur or

professional, should put to his thoughts or ideas before making an address.

The introductory notes to each speech give details concerning the occasion, the historical background of the speech, the speaker, the organization of ideas, and the response to the speech. Professor Baird includes only the most significant data in these analyses. The information is excellent, but by no means exhaustive. In most cases, students should be cautioned to make more extensive and intensive research on the several points mentioned in these introductory remarks.

The texts of twenty-eight speeches and one radio discussion are divided into eight groups: international policies, national attitudes, personal tributes, presidential campaign, science, business and labor, education, and religion. The addresses were selected because they mirrored 'the thinking and communicative techniques of speakers during 1948-49.' To the extent that these addresses are an index of the thinking and communicative techniques of the period reported, this volume is valuable to students of public address as well as to students of political and social sciences.

Since the purpose of the collection is to 'mirror the thinking and communicative techniques of speakers during 1948-49,' would it not be well to add a summary chapter indicating the trends in communicative techniques and indicating the trends in social, political, and economic thinking during the year? This reviewer believes that such a summary would be valuable at the end of a specific period—i.e., the war period, if not at the end of each volume. Would such a summary not give a note of finality to these volumes?

WILLIAM A. BEHL,
Brooklyn College

BASIC TRAINING IN SPEECH. Brief Edition. By Lester Thonssen and Howard Gilkinson. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1949; pp. 256. $2.25.

In this edition the authors have selected from their larger 1947 work 'those topics which seem most relevant to the purposes of a short practical introductory course.' Part 1 contains a discussion of the reflective and imaginative reactions of the speaker to his environment and experience, his social adjustment, and his attitude toward himself and others. Part 2 deals with basic speech habits: the speaker's control over visible and audible symbols of speech, clear articulation, ample vocabulary, and a reasonable conformance to the conventions of pronunciation. Part 3, by acknowledgment and extent of treatment, is one of the most important sections of the book. Its eight chapters concern the development of essential abilities which are put to test whenever a speaker prepares a speech: the selection of subject and speech end, the tools and procedures of research, analysis of factors in the speech situation, the parts of a speech, outline construction, and the principal methods of enforcing ideas. Included in this discussion of the techniques of speech composition is a treatment of methods, procedures, and criteria for good speech delivery. The final part of the book considers the adaptation of speech to special occasions—oral reading, debate, discussion, and radio speaking.

In meeting the needs of a textbook for a brief introductory course, the authors have avoided the 'intensive research approach' (QJS 33:524) which characterized their larger work. While findings of research are too often overlooked by writers of speech textbooks, these findings must of necessity be incidental to the discussion of principles in a short course. Appropriately excluded from this edition are chapters found in the larger text on experimental studies of audience reactions and objective measurements in speech. Also excluded are chapters on defective speech, the phonetic alphabet, theories of persuasion, and an appendix of materials for the study of oral style. The original chapters on the use of the dictionary and vocabulary building are well joined in a single chapter on word study.

The surprising thing about this book is that in a compact and convenient form, the authors have presented, with the exception of the previously mentioned omissions, substantially the same content found in the larger edition. This has been accomplished by rewriting chapter introductions, and eliminating chapter summaries and a number of exercises and selections for oral reading. A reduction in the size of the type employed in printing the text also contributed to its reduced size. One important addition is the introductory discussion on how a student should conduct himself as a listener and critic during classroom speeches. It should also be mentioned that the excellent exercises and illustrations have been brought up to date.

In several instances this reviewer felt the authors might have more satisfactorily abbreviated the contents of the larger text by rewriting rather than cutting material. For instance, to a beginning student whose social fear is augmented by problems of preparation, the statement that 'the preparation of speeches is dis-

cussed elsewhere in this book is hardly as reassurring as the helpful plan of preparation outlined in the larger text. It seems also unfortunate that they relegate the important consideration of critical reading and thinking to the position of a suggested exercise.

The authors have presented a good text for a short introductory speech course. Their freshness of imagination and fundamentally sound educational perspective makes it a valuable addition to the literature of our profession.

JOHN CRAWFORD,
Wesleyan University

PUBLIC SPEAKING WITHOUT FEAR AND TREMBLING. By Mark Hanna. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1949; pp. 166. $2.75.

For some reason, not entirely clear to this reader, the scout's evaluation of a ballplayer, 'Good field, no hit,' keeps coming to mind in connection with this volume. It is a disarmingly entertaining book to read and so, at first observation, appears of greater worth than a second, more thorough study, proves it to be.

A listing of the chapter headings (these speak for themselves) and a brief statement of the contents therein will show much overlapping of material.

Chapter 1. Neither Hall nor Mrs. Mills ever Returned Alive. Get attention by linking your subject to 1. Crime, or 2. Nature.

Chapter 2. In a Love Affair or a Speech, a Lot of Preliminary Only Wastes Time and Bores People.
People are interested in money.
People are interested in people, stories, drama.
People are interested in processes.
Employ quotations.
Startle the audience.
Be concrete, specific, definite.

Chapter 3. Beta Theta Pi, the Excelsior Fertilizer Works, and the Concatenated Order of the Hoo-Hoo . . . All Believe in Americanism.
Talk in terms of people.
Be concrete; the abstract bores.

Chapter 4. If Your Mind is Packed with Information, You'll Lose Much Initial Fear.
People are interested in love.
Read a great deal.
Take notes.
Sort the notes and organize them.
Write out the talk.
Never use notes in delivery.

Chapter 5. Ever See Anyone Win Anything with His Hands in His Pockets?
The way to rid yourself of stagefright is:
1. Prepare well.
2. Study people.
3. Be enthusiastic.
4. Use good facial expression, smile and be pleasant, and gesture.

Chapter 6. . . . the Damnedest Numbskull He'd Had Up a Tree in Twenty Years.
Be 'folksy.'
Employ the familiar and the unfamiliar.
Adventure is a fundamental appeal for attention.
Social problems have great fundamental appeals for attention.
The speaker must make his audience laugh, principally through the use of exaggeration, the combination of incongruous elements, the quick twist at the end, and scarcasm.

A glance at the foregoing indicates that subject-matter pertaining to 'interest' and 'attention,' occupies a good two-thirds of the chapters. Chapter headings give little clue to the contents, and even the sub-headings, such as in Chapter 2 (How to Have a Smash Beginning for Your Talk), mean little; for, contrary to Hanna's own advice, there is much preliminary to the real meat of each chapter. Incidentally, although Chapter 2 was supposed to have dealt with the opening remarks in a talk, it is in Chapter 4 (sub-titled How to Put Your Speech Together) that the best advice on this is given when the author writes:

> What is the most interesting thing I have in all my note material? What is the most spectacular? What is there of adventure? Of drama? What is there of human nature?
>
> Select the item which you think will have immediate appeal. Select the situation or story which you think will be infallible in getting audience attention.

The text is magnificently exemplified throughout by means of long quotations and at first sight they appear to be excellent in their application. Further study, however, shows that most of the referents are magazines and books. They read well but do they possess 'ear appeal'? Can they be delivered with effectiveness? Can they be imitated? This question is asked particularly in view of Professor Hanna's admonition not to memorize a talk or to use notes.

The author of the text is obviously attempting to train his students into a popular style and much might be accomplished in this direction in an adult group with which an instructor had contact but seldom. The text is exciting enough in style that adults will read it without

urging; this much cannot be said of most texts in public speaking. It will not find favor in the classroom.

ORMOND J. DRAKE,
New York University

THE HUMAN NATURE OF PLAYWRITING. By Samson Raphaelson. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949; pp. 267. $4.00.

During the spring term of 1948 Samson Raphaelson conducted a course in 'creative writing with emphasis on the drama' at the University of Illinois. *The Human Nature of Playwriting* is essentially a verbatim transcription of the proceedings of that class. (A stenographer sat in on the meetings.) The entire book is, therefore, cast in the form of a dialogue with Raphaelson acting the protagonist's role and the members of the class performing as antagonists and minor players.

Like most teachers of creative writing and like most books on the subject, Raphaelson pursues the thesis that writing must grow out of living, or as he puts it, 'Writing is living.' No one can write well of that which he does not know. What distinguishes the present treatment, however, is that the author demonstrates in pursuing the autobiographical materials and interests of this group of would-be writers how their characters and incidents can best be molded into the dramatic form. If Raphaelson has any specific thesis along this line—and mind you he repeatedly expresses his abhorrence for 'thesis' as a starting point for the would-be dramatist—it is that 'you rarely ever need material as much as viewpoint.' The effectiveness of this notion is well demonstrated as we follow the various class scripts from their germinal stage to their fifth or sixth reworking. The author is a great believer in the necessity for rewriting in the development of a play.

The chief value of the book lies in the direct, honest, and unhesitating probing that Raphaelson does on the students and on himself. He draws unashamedly and unpretentiously from his own experience as a writer. He is not interested in devising a formal treatise on the art of playwriting or in establishing any new doctrines to guide the prospective writer. He is instead devoted to discovering the nature of the day-to-day and scene-to-scene activities of the professional playwright. What principles of dramatic composition appear in the book are normally drawn from the immediate scripts or ideas in hand. Only one session was devoted exclusively to generalizations on technique. This inductive line offers the student a clear understanding of the general principle once it is reached. He has followed its development out of his own thinking and writing or that of his colleagues and its meaning will stay with him as a usable guide.

In a way Raphaelson was trying to duplicate in this class the atmosphere in which O'Neill had worked with the Provincetown group and Odets with the Group Theatre. An intimate exchange of ideas, he feels, is the happiest climate for the embryonic dramatist. Obviously this climate could not be achieved in a classroom with thirty students; so a half dozen students at a time met with the teacher at his home. These sessions were devoted to the detailed and intimate explorations of each writer's materials and problems. Raphaelson transferred the gist of these conferences to the class dialogues.

As would be expected from any such class, there was a recurring attempt to get the successful playwright to talk about his own experiences in the theatre. In the last few sessions he obliged; but it must be said to his credit that even here the talk was mainly of essential technical details that are required knowledge for the would-be playwright: contractural arrangements, author's privileges in relation to casting, rewriting, etc. Very briefly he touched on some of his experiences as a director.

Certainly here is a valuable addition to the would-be writer's library and work table. There are no new ideas on dramatic structure, but there is a well-marked path that others have followed with profit.

RICHARD MOODY,
Indiana University

ONE HUNDRED PLAYS FOR CHILDREN. Edited by A. S. Burack. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1949; pp. ix+886. $4.75.

This is a collection of short non-royalty plays chosen from the magazine *Plays*, and divided into four groups: plays celebrating holidays and special occasions; historical and costume plays; modern comedies; and fantasies, legends, and fables in dramatic form.

The barren field of short plays for children is in such dire need of enrichment that one approaches with eagerness this ponderous volume. But if he hopes for plays of distinction, he will be disappointed, for there is scarcely a play in the whole book which is outstanding.

Perhaps one should not expect superior work in a collection of non-royalty plays. But he cannot help wondering why they were not sifted by a half or a third, since so many are entirely lacking in dramatic standards. They may have seemed clever in the school in which they were first presented, but that does not mean they are

worth publishing. Many of them are woefully lacking in action, depending almost entirely on dialogue. In some cases, such as 'How We Got Our Numbers,' the authors have apparently tried to make facts interesting by putting them in dialogue form, thus making drama merely the sugar-coating on the pill.

An occasional play in the collection has, however, freshness and charm. 'The Town Mouse and His Country Cousin' by Violet Muse is one of these. Another is 'A Golden Ball for Mother' by Alice Very, an amusing play in verse, with a mouse hole for a setting, and a sign on the wall, 'Mice Working'! All the characters are mice or cats, the mice outwitting the cats with delightful cleverness.

'Goblin Parade' by Beulah Folmsbee employs the amusing device of a school janitor who doesn't think much of the play because of its lack of scenery. And Mary Thurman Pyle's 'Not on the Menu,' though not distinctive, is another usable play for a school assembly.

Two of the Americanization plays are worth using. 'The Lincoln Coat' by Thelma W. Sealock tells the touching story of a little Jewish boy who becomes ill worrying because he thinks he should not play the part of Lincoln, since his father, to keep him in school, has misrepresented his age. Less good, but worthy in its central idea, is Lavinia R. Davis' 'David and the Second Lafayette.'

Among the best of the historical plays are 'The First New England Christmas Tree' by Ella Stratton Colbo, 'Dolly Saves the Day' by Helen Louise Miller, and 'Not Only the Strong' by Helen E. Waite and Elbert M. Hoppenstedt. The first tells of a New England mother who risked incurring the wrath of the Puritan fathers by providing a Christmas tree to bring happiness to a tiny girl and her crippled brother. 'Dolly Saves the Day,' with General Washington as one of the characters, has the virtue of giving opportunity for plenty of action. 'Not Only the Strong,' a story of pioneer days in Kentucky, tells of the courage of a young girl who longed to be of service in the new country.

WINIFRED WARD,
Northwestern University

THE THEATRE ANNUAL. No. 7. Edited by William Van Lennep. New York: The Theatre Library Association, 1949: pp. 103. $1.50.

The new *Theatre Annual* contains five scholarly articles on theatrical subjects: one on scenery, one on the playwright, one on actors in general, and two on specific actors. Thus the space is fairly well distributed among the various branches.

The first of the five articles, introduced by Elinor Hughes, consists of reprints of four 'reviews' of Walter Hampden by Henry Taylor Parker (died 1934) of *The Boston Evening Transcript*. The 'reviews' seem much too panegyric to one who had the misfortune to see Hampden's Macbeth at a time when he had an incredibly bad Lady Macbeth, and his Cyrano on an 'off' day. Since Margaret Webster and Laurence Olivier are definitely keeping alive the romantic tradition in acting, one does not quite see the reason for reprinting these ecstatic pleas for a return to romance.

The second paper, by Drew B. Pallette, discourses chiefly upon one Duckworth Headlam and the social status of the English actor before Irving. This document is heavily footnoted from reviews, articles, and speeches of the period.

The third article is likewise dependent on reviews for the most part. It is an effort to evaluate the effect of the critics on the runs of Elmer Rice's plays. The author, Ralph L. Collins, abandons objectivity at the outset by vague definitions and highly debatable classifications. Halfway through the paper he abandons logic by ignoring the limitations he himself has set upon his subject. If this article were a master's thesis, it would need a thorough reorganization before Mr. Collins got his degree.

The fourth article, by Alan Downer, performs a definite service to the practically leisureless people of the theatre by digesting the bulky diaries of William Macready. Beneath the carping and dissatisfaction that make the diaries nearly unendurable, Mr. Downer reveals the essential conscientiousness, devotion, and humility of the great actor.

The last article concerns scenery in the early American theatre. If one has read Quinn, Odell, and Dunlap, one misses the 'thrill of discovery' in the article. It contains two good illustrations that are not to be found in Freedley and Reeves.

In general, the articles in No. 7 resemble papers written by competent graduate students. They might appropriately be published by AETA. But one might expect the Theatre Library Association to find and publish the *crème* of research, the sort of exciting article that Rosamund Gilder used to contribute to *Theatre Arts Monthly*. Well-illustrated, firsthand material on theatre history, theatre personalities, and national theatres is always needed; but however admirable seminar papers may be, one reads them as seminar papers in a dutiful mood.

MARIAN GALLAWAY,
University of Alabama

THE PLAY'S THE THING. By Joseph Mersand. New York: The Modern Chapbooks, 1948; pp. 101. $2.50.

THE AMERICAN DRAMA SINCE 1930. By Joseph Mersand. New York: The Modern Chapbooks, 1949; pp. 188. $2.00.

These two volumes by Joseph Mersand provide a satisfactorily brief discussion of the major playwrights and plays of our time. In *The Play's the Thing*, designed primarily for the purpose of giving high school students an introductory knowledge of contemporary theatre, Dr. Mersand points out that in the appreciation of the theatre there can be more than mere entertainment and excitement. He answers the question 'How to Know the Best Plays?', by referring the students to good radio dramas, good motion pictures, good play anthologies, and the Pulitzer Prize selections. He resolves the question 'What Makes Drama Great?' by asking students to recognize 'the unique merits of Shakespeare.' A cursory examination of the flood of Shakespearean criticism and analysis is indication enough that even for the high school student the 'unique merits of Shakespeare' may be obscure.

One can find little to question in his summaries of the contributions to the American theatre of Eugene O'Neill, Maxwell Anderson, Sidney Howard, Robert Sherwood, and Paul Green. Although one may wonder at the value —at least for high school students—of emphasizing the work of Rachel Crothers and Philip Barry when the plays of Elmer Rice, Clifford Odets, George S. Kaufman, and William Saroyan are at hand.

The American Drama since 1930, written for a more mature audience than *The Play's the Thing*, provided analyses of Kaufman, Rice, and Odets, with Clare Booth replacing Rachel Crothers. Probably the most interesting chapter in the volume is devoted to an analysis of the biographical play, and includes an excellent table listing over a hundred biographical plays —both musical and straight dramas—produced in New York between the years 1928 and 1947 under the headings of Living Characters, Name of Play, Author, and Number of Performances. From this tabular summary Mersand has found that eight musicians, nineteen writers, thirty-six political leaders, six actors, six criminals or prisoners, and an assorted collection of scientists, nurses, judges, religious characters, dancers, explorers, artists as well as a *bon vivant* (Falstaff) and a miscellaneous category including Dubarry, Lucrece, Annie Oakley, and Mary Surratt appeared in dramatized form on the New York stage in the two decades under discussion. In comparing this contemporary selection of political characters with those of the great classic historical dramas of the past, Mersand notes that the political leaders while still numerous are of a humbler social rank. Today the heroic is not confined to military or political leaders, and theatre audiences have seen such diversified figures as Sacco and Vanzetti, Walter Reed, and the Scottsboro Negroes.

Using 'Richard Merivale' instead of Philip Merivale and confusing Odell Shepherd with George C. D. Odell are careless errors. Mersand wishes that Miss Crothers would write on dramatic construction and technique, seemingly unaware of her lecture 'The Construction of a Play,' published in *The Art of Playwriting*, (Philadelphia, 1928).

For the layman or the high school student, these volumes will prove helpful, but to the student of the theatre who has read Joseph Krutch, George Jean Nathan, Clayton Hamilton, Brooks Atkinson, Stark Young, and Eric Bentley, they will hardly prove illuminating or provocative.

DELWIN B. DUSENBURY,
University of Florida

THE RADIO PLAY. By Martin Maloney. Evanston, Illinois: Student Book Exchange, 1949; pp. iii+241. $2.90.

In a Note to the Student, the opening section of this textbook, Mr. Maloney adequately and aptly states his approach to the problem of writing radio drama: '*The Radio Play* is . . . set within the context of creative writing quite as much as in the context of radio broadcasting.'

While the author covers briefly some of the usual data on the uses of sound, music, and special production devices, his book is valuable primarily because of the excellent treatment of the more fundamental phases of real creative work. If the student wants simply to learn how to write sound and music directions, let him go elsewhere. If he is interested in learning how to write good dialogue and narration, *The Radio Play* is for him.

Most of us who have done any writing at all for radio have found that one of our major concerns is trying to make our characters come alive. In a forty-page section the author deals specifically with this problem, and these forty pages contain all the intricacies of creating living persons on paper. Mr. Maloney is adamant about the constant repetition of stereotyped characters in most of our modern radio plays,

and he offers valuable hints for breaking away from this undesirable practice.

Two chapters treat the special problems of creating radio biography and documentary. Here the author reveals a broad cultural background in his choice of examples and illustrations from the literary forms of biography and documentary; the student will profit from the analytical treatment found in these chapters.

The concluding chapter, The Writer's Notebook, presents an extensive list of assignments for each chapter in the book. Any instructor using this text will find a wealth of information here, and he may select as many of these assignments as he desires. The suggestions are not in the realm of 'busy work'; rather, they are carefully thought out recommendations for learning to write sensible and praiseworthy radio dramatic scripts.

Mr. Maloney has done an excellent job of combining the scholarly and the theoretical approach with the practical and down-to-earth aspects of writing for radio. His philosophy is best stated in his own words: 'A good script writer must master the techniques of *radio*, especially those involved in acting and production, but his true kinship is with the novelist, the poet, the playwright, rather than with the announcer or the production director.'

GLEN A. BAMMANN,
Western Reserve University

HEARING IS BELIEVING. By Mary Hays Heiner. Cleveland and New York: World Publishing Company, 1949; pp. 126. $2.00.

This brief, well-written account of one person's successful adjustment to the loss of normal hearing is sure to receive a warm welcome among hearing therapists, who will want to make it required reading for mature adults who face a loss of hearing acuity or for parents who must make plans for children with hearing deficiencies. The book recommends itself because it is entertaining enough to hold interest, accurate enough to give a desirable orientation in hearing therapy, and constructive enough to hearten the person who is overwhelmed by the problems that beset the hard-of-hearing person.

Hearing Is Believing will probably serve better as an introduction to what can be done for defective hearing than, for example, Davis's *Hearing and Deafness*, which, in spite of its designation as 'a guide for laymen' is pretty difficult going for the newcomer to the field.

The story, briefly, is of a woman who loses her hearing quite suddenly during her college days and who gradually makes a successful adjustment, through the use of a hearing aid and lip reading, to her loss. From her experiences with the Cleveland Speech and Hearing Center, the author is able to comment broadly on the educational and social problems of the deaf and hard-of-hearing, and on the organization of community resources to meet these problems.

Many a speech therapist has already acknowledged his debt, in conducting programs of therapy for stutterers, to the widely-known autobiographical accounts of Wendell Johnson and Conrad Wedberg. Just as Johnson and Wedberg combine professional knowledge with personal insight, and thus may speak to stutterers as one of them, so Mrs. Heiner speaks to the person who must deal with a problem in hearing. It occurs to this reviewer that professional workers in the area are urgently in need of, and would do well to encourage the writing of, similar first-hand accounts by persons who have made a successful adjustment to the handicaps of cerebral palsy, aphasia, and other crippling speech and hearing disorders.

There is little in this book to criticize on the grounds of inaccuracy, considering its brevity and the fact that it is addressed to the layman rather than the professionally trained person. One could have wished that the kinds of hearing loss for which amplification promises assistance had been described more precisely, and that a clearer statement had been given as to how a person finding himself deficient in hearing should proceed in finding qualified assistance. But the reader is sure to feel that, on the whole, Mrs. Heiner has done a workmanlike and commendable job in making available to those who face a hearing loss the information that will help them to avoid the wasted effort and futile searchings of the hard-of-hearing for assistance.

JESSE J. VILLARREAL,
University of Texas

BASIC COMPOSITION. Book One. By Philip Burnham. Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1949; pp. xiii+450. $2.20.

Basic Composition is a systematic presentation of those fundamentals of grammar, punctuation, spelling, and usage essential in both talking and writing. The book is made up of Part One: Working with Simple Sentences, Part Two: Working with Complex and Compound Sentences.

It is clear that the author is an experienced and successful teacher of composition. He uses standard terminology, knows what is important, and what to teach first. He has not cluttered

his book with every possible language form. He has selected what is fundamental for high school students *now*. The items as presented in thirty projects are graduated in difficulty to make possible a steady development of grammatical relationships. The student is aided by exceptionally original exercises and visualizations through sentence diagrams. Each chapter, because of clarity and variety of method, is adapted to the slow student as well as the average and superior.

The applications of improved composition skills will appeal to boys and girls of high school age, because the types of reports, stories, letters, invitations, and discussions assigned are of everyday use in the school, in the home, and in the community.

The book is interesting. The language is precise and stimulating. Every new project is introduced so that it will get and hold the attention of students. There are almost fifty appropriate pictures as well as dozens of clever sketches scattered throughout the book. The paper is of good quality and the print clear and attractive.

Basic Composition can be adapted to a variety of teaching situations and to a variety of school organizations. It should be a popular choice by high school teachers.

GLADYS L. BORCHERS,
University of Hawaii

PHILOSOPHY IN LITERATURE. By Julian C. Ross. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1949; pp. xi+286. $3.00.

This is, indeed, an unusual book, and one which deserves the attention of all those who are concerned with improving instruction in undergraduate courses in the humanities. It shows how, by boldly cutting across the rigid departmental lines still prevailing in most colleges and universities, new life may be breathed into what students often regard as 'dead' subject-matter.

At the suggestion of Chancellor Tolley of Syracuse University—himself a philosopher—Julian C. Ross, Professor of English in Allegheny College, undertook to develop a course in philosophy by drawing from literature pertinent illustrations of certain persistent philosophical problems and the solutions which have been offered to them. *Philosophy in Literature* represents a re-writing of some of the classroom lectures which Ross prepared for this purpose.

Proceedings from the premise that a great work of literature is, among other things, an abstract idea particularized in terms of specific times, places, and characters, Ross argues that literature furnishes a natural avenue along which the study of philosophy may be approached. Furthermore, he asserts that when literature is thus used, philosophical problems not only become more interesting and more readily understandable, but also that the student will better see how they relate to the practical decision-demanding situations of everyday life. From start to finish his book is eloquent testimony to the validity of these contentions.

An exceptionally gifted writer, Mr. Ross has succeeded in making philosophy come alive, and he has, for the most part, done this without tumbling into the pits which await the amateur who dares to invade so exacting a field. The happy result is a work generally sound enough to be acceptable as a textbook in a beginning philosophy course, and, at the same time, attractive enough to hold the attention of the average adult reader.

But though the book itself is exciting, still more exciting is the suggestion made by Chancellor Tolley in its Preface that literature is only one of a number of subject-areas which might profitably be used as spring-boards for the consideration of philosophical problems. Political science, art, and history may, he believes, also be employed for this purpose. Few educators would, I think, be disposed to argue this point, and those of us who traffic in the various speech arts would, to a man, probably assert that we too possess admirable tools for attacking abstract questions. Certainly rhetoric, the theatre, and oral interpretation border upon philosophy just as closely as do art or history.

As usual, however, there appears to be a catch in the plan. As one reads with ever increasing admiration Mr. Ross' skilfully written chapters, he cannot help but think that a less highly gifted scholar-teacher would very probably have made a horrible botch of the whole undertaking. Unfortunately, there are not in the present-day academic fold many men who combine, as he does, sound scholarship with exceptional teaching ability. This, however, merely furnishes additional proof, if such be needed, that we are not getting the best potential human material into the teaching profession.

Perhaps some of the very considerable amount of time which schoolmen now spend in their favorite indoor sport of planning curricula and developing syllabi might more profitably be devoted to exhaustive and persistent campaigns aimed at recruiting better teaching personnel. In any event, those of us who believe that the teacher, rather than course content or instructional method, is the focus of any truly educative experience will find in *Philosophy in Edu-*

cation new grounds for strengthening our conviction.

D. F.

THE TOASTMASTER'S HANDBOOK. By Herbert V. Prochnow. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1949; pp. vi+374. $3.95.

To the harassed chairman of a proposed public event, this book provides a well-planned guide; to the speaker who has endured a poorly planned program, it brings considerable hope. The author's aim is to 'bring to the person in charge of a meeting a wealth of helpful material to assure . . . the capable discharge of his important duties.'

The valuable part of the book is the first three chapters. One is impressed with the quality of the counsel here offered. The toastmaster or chairman is given a thorough guide to the etiquette of handling a meeting, a brief course in courtesy to a speaker, and a short treatise on audience courtesy.

Unfortunately, however, from the fourth chapter to the end of the book Prochnow has been content to offer merely a compilation of introductions, responses, stories, epigrams, witticisms, and quotations. Most of these are oft-told tales, and many of them have appeared in some form or other in similar works. Though they are placed in convenient categories, and sources are adequately acknowledged, the speaker will find little to stimulate him.

WILLIAM C. CRAIG,
The College of Wooster

ADDITIONAL BOOKS RECEIVED

CHRISTINA ROSSETTI. A Portrait With Background. By Marya Zaturenska. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949; pp. 311. $4.00.

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT. Compiled by Julia E. Johnsen. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 21, No. 4. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1949; pp. 300. $1.75.

EDUCATION OF CRIPPLED CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES. By Romaine P. Mackie. Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Leaflet No. 80. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1949; pp. 12. 10c.

EQUALITY IN AMERICA. The Issue of Minority Rights. Compiled by George B. De-Huszar. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 21, No. 3. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1949; pp. 259. $1.75.

EVERYBODY'S REHEARSALLESS CHRISTMAS BOOKS. Pantomimes, Skits, Parties, Services, etc. Franklin, Ohio and Denver, Colorado: Eldridge Entertainment House, Inc., 1949; pp. 98. 75c.

HIGH-SCHOOL JOURNALISM. By Harold Spears and C. H. Lawshe. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949; pp. xii+136. $3.20.

HOW TO PRODUCE CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS. A Complete Production Handbook for Busy Teachers. Franklin, Ohio and Denver, Colorado: Eldridge Entertainment House, Inc., 1949; pp. 81. $1.00.

IN THE PERIODICALS

GIRAUD CHESTER, *Editor*

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS
WINSTON L. BREMBECK
University of Wisconsin

RADIO AND TELEVISION
GIRAUD CHESTER
Queens College

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION
HUGH Z. NORTON
University of Michigan

LANGUAGE AND PHONETICS
HAROLD WEISS
Southern Methodist University

SPEECH SCIENCE
JOHN V. IRWIN
University of Minnesota

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH
GIFFORD S. BLYTON
University of Kentucky

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH
JACK MATTHEWS
University of Pittsburgh

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS

ABRAMS, MARK, Possibilities and Problems of Group Interviewing, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 13 (Fall 1949).502-6.

'Experiments with interviewing respondents in groups, rather than singly, have shown this method to have a number of significant advantages. Principal problems encountered in group interviewing relate to the recruitment of the groups, their size and composition, training of interviewers, questionnaire design, and analysis of results.'

ALEXANDER, JOHN W., AND M. BERGER, Is the Town Meeting Finished? *American Mercury*, 69 (August 1949).144-51.

In a discussion of a recent survey of New England towns, the writer points out the small interest in the town meetings. 'The evidence we have found about the town meeting certainly demands serious reflection on some assumptions that we have been accepting without much thought. The town meeting is a sacred cow that deserves to be laid to rest.'

BERLIN, ISAIAH, Mr. Churchill, *The Atlantic*, 184 (September 1949).35-44.

The author discusses the foundations of Winston Churchill's speaking, writing, and general political behavior. Comparisons are made with Franklin D. Roosevelt.

BOGARDUS, EMORY S., Public Opinion and the Presidential Election of 1948, *Social Forces*, 28 (October 1949).79-83.

After suggesting that the public opinion process includes a challenging of some procedure, a defense-advocacy debate, contradictory propaganda procedures, and a decision with accompanying redefinition of the issues, the author provides additional thought for those who still seek the answer to the 1948 riddle.

CARLETON, WILLIAM G., Let Us Keep Debating in Our Schools, *Vital Speeches*, 15 (1 September 1949).703.

A professor of political science emphasizes the values of debate training. 'The most important lesson learned in school debating, however, is respect for that rigorous winnowing process whereby the relevant factors are culled from the irrelevant and presented in the simplest and clearest way—respect for classic clarity of thought and expression.'

CARTWRIGHT, DORWIN, Some Principles of Mass Persuasion, *Human Relations*, 2, No. 3 (1949).253-67.

In setting forth certain principles of mass persuasion this paper 'draws upon the extensive program of wartime research conducted for the War Finance Division of the United States Treasury Department by the Division of Program Surveys of the Department of Agriculture. The immediate aims of the research program were to help guide policy decisions in the development of a program of inflation control through the sale of Savings Bonds.'

CONSTANS, H. P., The Role of Intercollegiate Debate Tournaments in the Post-War Period, *Southern Speech Journal*, 15 (September 1949).38-44.

The purpose of this provocative paper is 'to point out some changes that have taken place and are taking place in intercollegiate debating, and to project the trends indicated into the

future, which, for convenience, I have called the post-war period.'

HILGARD, ERNEST R., Human Motives and the Concept of Self, *The American Psychologist*, 4 (September 1949).374-82.

Students of persuasion theory are given a thoughtful discussion of human motives.

KRUEGER, RICHARD F., The Reliability of Debate Judges, *The Gavel*, 32 (November 1949). 7-9.

An exploration is made of some factors which may account for some of the dissatisfaction with the decisions of debate judges.

LOMAS, CHARLES W., Southern Orators in California before 1861, *Southern Speech Journal*, 15 (September 1949).21-37.

After pointing out the dominant role played by southern orators in California's early politics, the author singles out for special consideration as typical orators of this period Edmund Randolph of Virginia and Louisiana, Henry S. Foote of Mississippi, and William M. Gwin of Mississippi. 'If there is one characteristic above all others in the public speaking of California in the fifties, it is the extent to which the passions of the day entered into and colored their utterances.'

MONAGHAN, JAY, When Were the *Debates* First Published? *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, 42 (September 1949).344-7.

The controversy over the first publication date of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates and the role this played in Lincoln's nomination are re-examined and new evidence is presented.

MORSE, ANDREW J., The Effect of Popular Opinion on Campaign Slogans—An Illustration, *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 13 (Fall 1949). 507-10.

'The influence of public opinion on the content of campaign speeches is often greater than the effect of the speeches on the public. An illustration of this phenomenon is afforded by Winston Churchill's Comments in the British General Election of 1918.

NICOLAY HELEN, The Writing of Abraham Lincoln: A History, *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, 42 (September 1949).259-71.

The only daughter of Lincoln's private secretary and biographer tells how her father and John Hay went about writing this book which has served as a source book for so many students of Lincoln.

O'CONNOR, RICHARD, Bob Ingersoll, the Devil's Ambassador, *The American Mercury*, 59 (November 1949).586-93.

The family history of the 'Great Agnostic' and his verbal tussles with the clergy of his time are told in delightful manner.

PINK, MARGARET, Junior Town Meeting Movement, *The Social Studies*, 40 (November 1949). 293-6.

A review is made of the brief history of this new discussion movement, suggestions are given as to how to conduct Junior Town Meetings, and the values of such meetings are pointed out.

PITT, CARL A., Wendell Willkie: Debater, *Speech Activities*, 5 (Autumn 1949).99-101.

The author examines 1. Willkie's early debating experiences at the Elwood, Indiana, High School, and at Indiana University, and 2. the opinions of congressmen, senators, judges, and others in an attempt to learn the factors which accounted for Mr. Willkie's ability as a public speaker.

POSEY, WALTER B., The Slavery Question in the Presbyterian Church in the Old Southwest, *The Journal of Southern History*, 15 (August 1949).311-24.

The author finds very challenging the opposing opinions regarding the attitude of the Southwestern Presbyterian pulpits over the slavery question and traces the slavery issue in the Presbyterian Church in the Old Southwest from the first formal action in 1787 until 1837 when the church divided into the Old and New Schools.

ROBERTSON, D. W., JR., Frequency of Preaching in Thirteenth Century England, *Speculum*, 24 (July 1949).376-88.

The 'evidence concerning preaching in English Episcopal Decrees and in the documents of the thirteenth century does not indicate that a sermon was a rare event. . . . Moreover, we do not lack evidence that, in the ordinary parish, sermons were regularly delivered on Sundays and on feast days. The quaint old thirteenth century priest who fumbles through a rare sermon on the pages of certain modern historical writings may be considered a fiction.'

RADIO AND TELEVISION

ALLEN, HAROLD B., Mass Pressure on Radio and Journalism, *English Journal*, 38 (October 1949).447-53.

Teachers of communication cannot ignore their responsibilities to prepare students to be-

come 'critical users of the mass mediums of communication.' The goal should be to enable students to understand the operations of the press and radio, the activity of pressure groups, and the pressures upon and within the mass media themselves.

ANDERSON, BORGHILD F., Are Good Radio Listeners Made? *English Journal*, 38 (September 1949).391-4.

A high school teacher reports on a project that linked school and home to encourage more discriminating radio listening.

CARSON, SAUL, Notes toward an Examination of the Radio Documentary, *Hollywood Quarterly*, 4 (Fall 1949).69-74.

The radio documentary cannot hope to achieve genuine status unless it is broadcast on a regularly scheduled basis. 'No matter how competently planned and executed, it will most often be just another catch-as-catch-can entry in the broadcaster's "public service" dossier.'

CASSIRER, HENRY R., Television News: A Challenge to Imaginative Journalists, *Journalism Quarterly*, 26 (September 1949).277-80.

'The all-embracing nature of television news constitutes a great challenge to American journalists. A good eye and ear for news, and a good pen to describe it are still vital. But the modern newsman also must have the technical know-how that enables him to translate events into visual terms. He must know something about newsreel camera work. He must be familiar with the potentialities of television remote pickups. He must know the essentials of graphic art. And he must be trained to write to the picture, rather than to describe the event in mere verbal terms.'

CROSS, PETER D., British Television, *Britian Today*, (July 1949).15-9.

A fairly optimistic picture about the future of British television.

ESHENFELDER, ALMA F., Radio Forum Helps Solve Community Problems, *American City*, 64 (May 1949).108-9.

A brief account of a successful community radio forum broadcast weekly in New London, Connecticut, which has succeeded in initiating action on local issues discussed on the program.

KREMENLIEV, BORIS, Background Music for Radio Drama, *Hollywood Quarterly*, 4 (Fall 1949).75-83.

'Radio background music, like music in opera, motion pictures, musical comedy, ballet, and television, serves essentially to create atmosphere and heighten emotion. It keeps the story moving by giving it color and by holding the attention of the listener. And it has an added, special function peculiar to the medium because it must attempt, together with the narrator and sound effects, to compensate for the missing visual image. Thus radio music is one of the most exacting technical and creative challenges faced by the contemporary commercial composer.'

LESSING, LAWRENCE P., The Television Freeze, *Fortune*, (November 1949).123-7, 157ff.

Lessing argues that 'with patience, hard work, and possibly two years of delay right after the war, the FCC and the industry could have built a sounder, less chaotic TV system in the higher frequencies.' An historical review of FCC policy toward AM, FM, and TV since the end of the war.

MARTIN, LESLIE JOHN, Press and Radio in Palestine under the British Mandate, *Journalism Quarterly*, 26 (June 1949).186-93.

An account of news broadcasting over the Palestine Broadcasting Station which began to function in 1936, and the Near East Arab Broadcasting Corporation located at Jaffa.

PARSONS, RUBY A., Radio in U. S. Zone of Germany, *U. S. Department of State Bulletin*, 21 (25 July 1949).83-5.

Efforts by the Military Government to set up democratically conceived and operated radio stations in the U. S. Zone of Germany are described.

Post-war International Broadcasting, *World Today*, 5 (June 1949).258-66.

'The most striking thing about post-war international broadcasting is its extent.' Over 50 nations are now engaged in short-wave broadcasting, with the basic programs being news. 'The way in which news, and commentary on the news, are presented is what primarily distinguishes one broadcasting service from another.' In international broadcasting, 'It is essential to retain the initiative. The side that defends itself against an attack, just or unjust, merely draws attention to the charge against which it would defend itself.'

RORTY, JAMES J., Harold Smith and the Dogs of Sin, *Harper's*, 199 (August 1949).69-75.

An account of a fundamentalist preacher in the South and the difficult problems he has posed for radio stations and the FCC.

What Will Television Do for Music? *Etude*, 67 (June 1949).339, 342, 386.

'Will television supersede the great symphonic and concert programs which have made American radio distinguished throughout the world? Our guess is that it will not. One orchestra looks very much like every other orchestra, and televising of great orchestras, and even great concert performers does not offer the continuous eye appeal demanded by television.'

Wood, Helen, and Raymond D. Larson, Annual Earnings of Radio Artists in 1947, *Monthly Labor Review*, 69 (September 1949).268-72.

A summary of a Bureau of Labor Statistics survey of the earnings of actors, singers, announcers, and sound effects men regularly employed in the radio industry.

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

Barrault, Jean-Louis, Child of Silence, *Theatre Arts*, 33 (October 1949).28-31.

Barrault's article on pantomime has been translated for us by Eric Bentley. The author contends that we live in an age of talkers and writers but 'we have lost our instinct for gesture.' He has hopes that it will soon again 'be recognized as a legitimate department of theatre art.'

Bavely, Ernest, How to Select the One-Act Play, *Dramatics*, 21 (November 1949).8-9.

Bavely, editor of *Dramatics*, draws upon his great personal experience, and calls upon well-known authorities to assist him in advising the reader on the problems of play selection for the educational theatre.

Benet, W. R., The Phoenix Nest, *Saturday Review of Literature*, 32 (25 June 1949).13.

Benét recommends a new book on modern poetry by Lloyd Frankenburg, entitled *Pleasure Dome: Reading Modern Poetry*, published by Houghton Mifflin. The author contends that much of the obscurity of modern poetry results from 'the habit of silent reading.' Benét agrees but believes that poetry, when read aloud, should be done by 'someone who combines a real love and knowledge of poetry with the proper vocal equipment and training.'

Bentley, Eric, German Stagecraft Today, *Kenyon Review*, 11 (Autumn 1949).630-48.

This essay is mainly concerned with Bertolt Brecht's method of Epic Realism in the German theatre of today. 'The theatre of Epic Realism has more in common with the great theatre of the remoter past than with the theatre of today and yesterday.'

Brecht, Bertolt, Chinese Acting, *Furioso*, 4 (Fall 1949).68-77.

'The Chinese theatre seems to us uncommonly precious, its presentation of human passions merely schematic, its conception of society rigid and false. At first sight, nothing in this great art seems useful in a realistic and revolutionary theatre.' The Chinese actor and the Western performer are compared and discussed by Brecht, with special emphasis on the 'alienation effect' in Chinese acting.

Fallon, Gabriel, The Poet in the Theatre, *Irish Monthly*, 77 (October 1949).463-9.

Fallon condemns the poet for his general attitude toward the theatre. 'So long as the poet refuses to unbend sufficiently to take his part in co-operating with the actor and the audience then so long will the theatre be without the poet.'

Gassner, John, The Theatre Arts, *Forum*, 112 (July 1949).32-5.

Gassner takes stock of twentieth century drama and its search for a 'style to which it could adhere.' It 'still adheres to a style that it continues to recognize as old-fashioned and dated but which it cannot discard for lack of anything to put in its place—and this not without having made a number of efforts to develop a substitute.'

Gassner, John, The Theatre Arts, *Forum*, 112 (August 1949).90-2.

Gassner reviews the chief production styles of the modern theatre, and comments: 'After 75 years the Western theatre has explored many styles and techniques only to witness the exhaustion of each of them. Some of these exhausted themselves quickly and quite thoroughly so that they have proved fruitful only on very rare occasions and then only when diluted.'

Javits, J. K., A National Theatre for America, *Tomorrow*, 8 (July 1949).11-6.

This article offers suggestions for the development of a National Theatre in America, and gives us a report on organizations which are working toward that objective.

Katona, Arthur, Social Drama in Education, *Educational Forum*, 13 (May 1949).462-7.

Katona divides educational drama into five categories: social drama proper, role-playing,

sociodrama, script reading, dramatic recording. He illustrates how each may serve as an effective aid to education.

KIRKLAND, ALEXANDER, The Matterhorn at Twilight, *Theatre Arts*, 33 (November 1949).26-9.

Kirkland gives us a biographical study of Ethel Barrymore, covering her distinguished stage career from 1894 to the present.

LABAN, RUDOLF, The Art of Movement on the Stage, *Drama*, n.s. No.14 (Autumn 1949).9-12.

'The whole range of human behaviour and aspiration is expressed by movement. The mastery of the art of movement is therefore paramount for the stage artist and should be the basis of any training for the stage.'

LAVER, JAMES, Gordon Craig and the English Theatre, *Drama*, n.s. No.13 (Summer 1949).24-8.

Laver pays tribute to Gordon Craig, who represents a solitary force 'raising the whole art of the theatre to a new potential.' According to Laver, this influence has been felt least in England.

MYERS, PAUL, American Musical Theatre, *Dramatics*, 21 (October 1949).7-8.

This is the first of a series of seven articles by Myers on the history of the American musical theatre. This, and the succeeding three articles, are devoted to 'a chronological account of the development of the American musical.' The final three articles will be devoted to 'the operetta,' 'the book show,' and 'the revue and extravaganza.'

NATHAN, GEORGE JEAN, The Theatre's Nonsensical Beliefs, *American Mercury*, 69 (November 1949).559-63.

There are numerous theories and beliefs about theatre, which repeatedly have been proved false. Nathan sums up those which are most popular, and offers evidence to disprove them.

SARGENT, JAMES M., Light, Tough, Practical Armor, *Players*, 26 (October 1949).9-10.

Sargent has set down simple step-by-step directions and diagrams for successfully solving the problem of making durable stage armor.

SEEDORF, EVELYN H., An Experimental Study in the Amount of Agreement among Judges in Evaluating Interpretation, *Journal of Educational Research*, 43 (September 1949).10-21.

This is a study of four experiments to determine 'how much agreement there is among individuals and groups of individuals in their responses to an oral interpretation of literature.' Statistical charts are included.

LANGUAGES AND PHONETICS

ABERCROMBIE, DAVID, What Is a 'Letter'? *Lingua*, 2 (August 1949).54-63.

The word *letter* once had three attributes—*nomen*, its identification; *figura*, as it was written; *potestas*, as it was pronounced. Phonetic alphabets attempt to reconcile the three aspects of the *letter*.

BORLAND, LOREN R., The National Health Insurance Bogey, *ETC*, 6 (Summer 1949).213-7.

A dentist analyzes the arguments presented against National Health Insurance, pointing out the confused semantic structure. He suggests that the field of legislative proposals is fertile for application of the evaluative techniques of general semantics.

CARLSON, GUSTAV, The Argot of Number Gambling, *American Speech*, 24 (October 1949).189-93.

The author presents a glossary of terms unique to the number gambling world. These terms were gathered in the course of an extensive sociological study of number gambling in Detroit's Negro community.

DALY, MASON G., Richard Baxter, Directions against Intolerance, *ETC*, 6 (Summer 1949).245-50.

The 'directs' of Richard Baxter, a Presbyterian cleric who lived in England from 1615 to 1691, have the ring of modern general semantics. This article quotes from the works of Baxter and indentifies the material with present-day semantic nomenclature.

FISCHER-JORGENSON, ELI, Kenneth L. Pike's Analysis of American English Intonation, *Lingua*, 2 (August 1949).3-13.

The author recognizes the importance of Pike's work to structural linguistics. He points out other criteria by which intonation might be characterized, suggesting more attention to minimal segments of pitch sequence.

HAUGEN, EINAR, Phoneme or Prosodeme? *Language*, 25 (July-September 1949).278-82.

Stress, pitch, duration, and juncture—all of them are somehow related to syllabic contour. These, and other 'prosodemes,' should be set off from the phonemes by a correspondingly different terminology.

HENNINGER, GEORGE A., Teaching Pronunciations and Meanings, *California Journal of Secondary Education*, 24 (May 1949).296-300.

The author outlines 1. methods for teaching dictionary pronunciation; 2. ideas for expanding the vocabulary, such as learning basic roots, suffixes, and prefixes. Although pronunciation is easy to learn by imitation, the method involving dictionary symbols is more difficult.

HUTTEN, ERNEST H., A Note on Semantics, *Philosophy*, 24 (October 1949).381-83.

The construction of the semantic language system arises from the need of reconstructing our language—and in particular the language of science—in a logical manner so that we can establish more clearly the meaning of our sentences.

LEIGHTON, ANN, Conversation, *Atlantic*, 184 (August 1949).60-2.

'Good conversation is humanity at its best, in a disembodied way, a simple Paradise within reach, unlike other blueprints of 'eternity.' The author details the roadblocks in the path of this ideal social intercourse.

LLOYD, DONALD J., The Main Drifts of the English Language, *The English Journal*, 38 (October 1949).438-44.

The one constant in the history of the English language has been change. In general, the drift has been from inflected complexity to an almost uninflected simplicty. The use of function words and significant word order are the major means of conveying meaning.

MEDAWAR, P. B., The Scientific Method, *The Nineteenth Century and After*, 146 (August 1949).115-20.

The structure of knowledge is built up by the prosecution of the scientific method. Requisite for such methodology is proper formulation of hypotheses, logical syntax and semantics, experimentation.

MINTON, ARTHUR, The Muse of Mammon, *American Speech*, 24 (October 1949).171-80.

The author examines the language of financial newswriting. The figurative language used is presumed to be helping the practitioner seek the balm or stimulation given by words. American market language seems to be in keeping with the strong coloring characteristic of the national life.

ORTIZ, CARMELITA LOUISE, English Influence on the Spanish of Tampa, *Hispania*, 32 (August 1949).300-4.

Ideas that could not be expressed in idiomatic Spanish have appeared in Hispanized English in hybrid forms. In the Spanish newspapers of Tampa phrases such as 'bloodbanks' and 'March of Dimes' are translated literally.

RICHARDS, I. A., Emotive Language Still, *Yale Review*, 39 (Autumn 1949).108-18.

The following six processes are involved whenever we use language: Indicating, Characterizing, Realizing, Appraising, Influencing, Structuring. Almost all words and phrases are both descriptive and emotive, being at the same time referential and influential.

SPEARS, MABEL Y., 'W'ere,' 'W'en,' 'W'y,' 'W'ich,' 'W'at,' *College English*, 11 (October 1949).38-9.

This short note bewails the loss of aspiration at the beginning of *wh* words.

STETSON, R. H., Segmentation, *Lingua*, 2 (August 1949).46-53.

'The present phonemics fails to recognize the inclusive character of the units whereby the phoneme is an aspect of the syllable factor, the syllable factor an aspect of the syllable, the syllable an aspect of the foot, and the foot of the breath group.'

THOMAS, FRANK W., What Does That Word Mean? *California Journal of Secondary Education*, 24 (April 1949).197-8.

This editorial indicates the unreliability of words as messengers of meaning to the adolescent, particularly if his background has been barren of the vocabulary of learning.

TRAPIDO, JOEL, The Language of the Theatre, I, The Greeks and Romans, *Educational Theatre Journal*, 1 (October 1949).18-26.

The terminology included in this article abstracts a glossary of theatrical terms collected by the author. In this lexicon are words dealing with the auditorium and stage, scenery and stage machinery, play forms, organization, and personnel of the classical period.

SPEECH SCIENCE

BLACK, JOHN W., Loudness of Speaking: The Effect of Heard Stimuli on Spoken Response *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 39 (June 1949).311-5.

Black's findings emphasize the tendency of subjects to match the level of heard stimulus

materials whether the stimuli were words to be repeated or questions to be answered. 'Repeated words were spoken more intensely than were answers to questions that were heard under the same conditions. Finally, it was not possible for the Ss to "say back" words at a single level of intensity when they were heard at different levels.'

BLEEKER, J. D. J. W. AND HL. DE VRIES, The Microphonic Activity of the Labyrinth of the Pigeon, Part I: The Cochlea and Part II: The Response of the Cristae in the Semicircular Canals, *Acta Oto-Laryngologica*, 37, Fasc. IV (August 1949).289-97, 298-306.

The problems of the functional meaning of the electric response have not yet been settled. Generally the microphonics are considered as incidental. The authors suggest that microphonic responses of the cristae support their belief that electrical responses function importantly in the transmission of the mechanical energy to the sense cells.

CANTRIL, HADLEY, ADELBART AMES, JR., ALBERT H. HASTORF, AND WILLIAM H. ITTELSON, Psychology and Scientific Research, I. The Nature of Scientific Inquiry, *Science*, 110 (4 November 1949).461-4.

In this, the first of three articles, the authors state that 'sometimes the scientist's interest in building up the content of his discipline sidetracks him from a consideration of the scientific process itself and creates a lag in the understanding and improvement of scientific tools. What follows is an attempt to clarify our thinking about the nature of scientific research in those fields which take upon themselves the primary responsibility of accounting for man's thoughts and behavior.'

CONDON, E. U., Is There a Science of Instrumentation? *Science*, 110 (7 October 1949). 339-42.

Answering his question affirmatively, Condon states that 'there is a useful body of general doctrine and data which can be termed the science of instrumentation.' Common elements of instrumentation in different areas are described, as is the instrumentation program of the National Bureau of Standards. The objectives of this program are: 1. analyses of available techniques in terms of precision and reliability, 2. analyses of materials, components, and elements now imposing limitations, 3. development of specific instruments not now available.

GLASER, E.M., The Effects of Cooling and Warming on the Vital Capacity, Forearm and Hand Volume, and Skin Temperature of Man, *Journal of Physiology*, 109 (15 September 1949). 421-9.

Glaser concludes that in a cold medium the vital capacity of five subjects diminished, in a hot humid medium vital capacity increased, and that return to normal laboratory temperature reversed these changes. The author describes simple apparatus which will measure the water displacement of a limb under conditions when plethysmographic investigations are impractical.

GOODFRIEND, LEWIS S., Problems in Audio Engineering. *Audio Engineering*, 33 (August 1949).19-20, 31.

Part Four of this series is a study of sound waves, their characteristics, and their transmission. Basic definitions, including some from the proposed American Standard, are presented with diagrams.

HARRIS, J. DONALD, Some Suggestions for Speech Reception Testing, *Archives of Otolaryngology*, 50 (October 1949).388-405.

Harris describes carefully certain techniques in the administration and evaluation of speech reception tests. He concludes that two major requirements of a speech reception test are 1. representativeness in sampling speech sounds and 2. homogeneity of intelligibility. These criteria can be secured by: 1. selecting words that include an adequate sample of English speech sounds, 2. recording this list with high fidelity, 3. determining the relative intelligibility of each word, 4. re-recording, compensating for each word so that the relative intelligibility of all words tends toward an average.

IRWIN, ORRIS C., Infant Speech, *Scientific American*, 18 (September 1949).22-4.

'How does an infant learn to talk? With what phonetic equipment does a newborn baby come into the world? How is the baby's I.Q. related to his speech? Are there laws of speech development?' The author describes both techniques used and answers obtained in investigation of these questions. Irwin concludes that at least some progress has been made in these areas and that the 'next step in this enterprise is to discover remedial measures for babies whose speech seems to show retardation.'

JONES, MARVIN F., AND F. C. EDMONDS, Acoustic and Vestibular Barometry, *Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology*, 58 (June 1949). 323-44.

Described are certain effects of air pressure change on the hearing and equilibrium of 32 unoperated and 8 fenestrated ears. Their results emphasize the importance of the damping functions of the drum and ossicles in the low and middle frequencies, and emphasize that a functioning drum and ossicular chain is necessary to obtain changes in hearing due to altered air pressure. Further study may establish the air pressure test as a measure for stapes fixation.

LEBEL, C. J., New Developments in Logarithmic Amplifiers, *Audio Engineering*, 33 (September 1949).15-7, 45-6.

LeBel describes a method of converting an audio signal to an output voltage which is equal to the logarithm of the input voltage, independent of frequency or input voltage. Also suggested are methods of recording such data.

PLANCK, MAX, The Meanings and Limits of Exact Science, *Science*, 110(30 September 1949). 319-27.

Planck explores the futility of the idea of starting out on scientific exploration from something irrevocably real and concludes that such ultimate reality is of a metaphysical character and can never be completely known. As a possible starting point, the author suggests rather 'That which we experience with our own body.' Thus 'the real world of metaphysics is not the starting point, but the goal of all scientific endeavor, a beacon winking and showing the way from an inaccessibly remote distance.'

THE TEACHING OF SPEECH

FERGUSON, C. W., Democracy: The People's Charge, *National Parent Teacher*, 44 (September 1949).18-20.

The author describes several methods of discussion that may be used to facilitate the democratic process.

GUNN, M. AGNELLA, Speech in the English Program, *Elementary English*, 26 (November 1949).399-403.

Through its various speech activities the English department has a vehicle for cooperating with all other departments in the school. Several suggestions for realizing this goal are presented by the author.

LEONARD, EMMA MAE, From Panel Discussions to Orations: Seniors' Thinking Problems, *English Journal*, 38 (October 1949).433-8.

English for high school seniors should prepare them to meet the problems of thinking and communication which they will meet after graduation. A course designed to meet these requirements is described and evaluated.

MURPHY, ANGELINE, Language Arts and Safety, *Safety Education*, 29 (November 1949).19.

A sixth grade teacher combines language arts with a study of safety. The program was full of rich experiences involving 'individual expression of ideas, reporting, announcing, dramatics, vocal planning, or group expression, and correct word usage.'

PEINS, MARYANN, For Better Speech, *Elementary English*, 26 (November 1949).404-6.

Speech in the elementary schools should be an integrating subject. Some helpful techniques are offered to fulfill this aim.

SHELLHAMMER, LOIS B., Solving Personal Problems Through Sociodrama, *English Journal*, 38 (November 1949).503-5.

'Sociodrama is the acting-out of a situation which is described by the members of the group and which is a common problem to them.' It provides practice in public speaking, dramatization, and group discussion while assisting the members of the group in gaining insight into their problems.

STEINMETZ, FLOYD S., Managing Your Talk, *Personnel*, 26 (September 1949).145-56.

Practical suggestions for preparing and presenting talks for business and industrial groups.

TROUT, JOHN, Debating for Everyone, *English Journal*, 38 (November 1949).506-11.

A philosophy for debate clubs is molded by a group of high school debaters: '1. The club should turn nobody away, 2. the club respects each member's availability, 3. we fit the topic to the speaker, 4. the program should provide a range of outlets and incentives, 5. the role of the judge is educational.'

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

BICE, HARRY V., Two Steps toward Improvement of Psychological Services for the Cerebral Palsied, *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 54, No. 2 (October 1949).212-7.

We should consider and redefine the subclassifications of the exogenous cases. Care must

be taken so that we do not put cases into this group that do not belong there. It is necessary to develop tests which will help reach this objective.

BROWN, SPENCER F., Advising Parents of Early Stutterers, *Pediatrics*, 4 (August 1949).170-6.

The author presents information to the physician concerning stuttering.

BROWNE, DENIS, Hare-Lip, *Annals of the Royal College of Surgeons of England*, 5, No. 5 (September 1949).169-87.

The author confines his subject to the double cleft and displaced premaxilla. The elements of the deformity are discussed and his own methods of operating are described.

CROSLAND, JOHN, Some Wider Aspects of Cerebral Palsy, *Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 28, No. 3 (June 1949).227-30.

The author discusses the rehabilitation of cerebral palsied children, their program adjustment, and their adjustment to their problem. The immediate role of the parent in aiding the child to get well is stressed.

CROSLAND, JOHN H., Some Wider Aspects of the Management of Cerebral Palsy, *Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation*, 28, No. 3 (June 1949).227-30.

Crosland discusses adjustment of rehabilitation program to the child's handicap and level of intelligence.

CRUICKSHANK, WILLIAM M., AND JANE E. DOLPHIN, A Study of the Emotional Needs of Crippled Children, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 45, No. 5 (May 1949).295-305.

Tests given to 87 crippled children to determine emotional needs are described. The group included children with cerebral palsy, cardiac conditions, and polio.

EUSTIS, RICHARD S., Right or Left Handedness, *New England Journal of Medicine*, (17 February 1949).240, 249-53.

The significance of handedness and the problem of the lefthanded child are discussed.

GLORIG, ARAM, Visual Aids in Speech Reading Instruction, *Hearing News*, 17 (October 1949).1.

A discussion of a new visual aid which is a motion picture film that can be adapted to classroom use. The film is being made by the Photographic Department of the Army under the direct supervision of the Audiology Center.

HATCHER, CORA, Athetoids Relax—and Speak, *The Crippled Child*, 27, No. 1 (June 1949).14-6.

The various approaches in making an athetoid relax and induce him to speak are given. Visual and vocal stimulation and rhythmic patterns are essential in a training program. Most important is infinite patience.

HEILMAN, ANN E., Appraisal of Abilities of the Cerebral Palsied Child, *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 53 (April 1949).606-9.

A discussion of the present-day testing practices, the problems of testing cerebral palsied children, and suggestions for future research.

HOPKINS, LOUISE, Rubella-Deafened Infants: Comparison of a Group of Rubella-Deafened Children with a Group of Hereditarily Deaf Children and Their Siblings, *American Journal of Diseases of Children*, 78 (August 1949).182.

The author describes a comparative study of 92 cases of deaf children whose mothers had had rubella in the first trimester of pregnancy with 61 cases of deaf children who had not been born of mothers who had had rubella. She concludes that rubella in the mother in the first trimester caused developmental arrest and that the arrest was modified by variation in the period at which the rubella occurred.

JOHANSEN, HENRIK, AND WILLIAM KLÆER, *Archives of Otolaryngology*, 50, No. 3 (September 1949).264-83.

In 14 out of 17 cases with pulmonary tuberculosis, contact ulcers of vocal process were found to be certainly tuberculous, and two likely tuberculous. A patient with contact ulcer is always to be suspected of having pulmonary tuberculosis until this is refuted.

KING, BRIAN T., Progress in Dealing with Vocal Cord Paralysis, *The Journal of the International College of Surgeons*, 12(May-June 1949).288-96.

The author describes the various operations to relieve vocal cord paralysis. The prime objective of all operations for the relief of the bilateral vocal paralysis is to secure an adequate airway and a usable voice. There is a discussion of reconstruction of the paralyzed larynx, results, reasons for failure, effects on voice, and a case study.

KNAPP, PETER HOBART, Emotional Aspects of Hearing Loss, *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 10 (July-August 1949).203-22.

Five hundred and ten patients from an Army Hearing Rehabilitation Service were studied psychiatrically, and classified according to the relationship of their hearing loss to their psychiatric disability.

PALMER, MARTIN F., Help Your Baby Learn to Talk, *Parents'* (May 1949).29, 96-101.

The author describes the speech development in the normal child and indicates a number of things that parents can do to help their child to develop adequate speech.

PEINS, MARYANN, You Can Help at Home, *The Crippled Child*, 27 (July-August).20-23.

Some form of speech training, properly handled, can take place in the home. Often a child unable to receive the benefits of speech work at a clinic or at a special school can be helped in this way. Not all cases can be treated at home and not every parent can carry out the suggested corrective training procedures. The author tells how a course of home training can be carried on.

PERLSTEIN, MEYER A., Drug Therapy in Cerebral Palsy, *The Crippled Child*, 27 (July-August 1949).8-10.

Perlstein discusses the use of various drugs as aids in training of children with cerebral palsy.

RICHARDS, LYMAN G., The Dilemma of Otolaryngology, *The Pennsylvania Medical Journal*, 52 (August 1949).1-4.

The author deplores the fact that to compete well in the future field of otolaryngology the candidate must be a superman who will be adequately prepared as an anatomist, physiologist, biochemist, audiophysicist, allergist, internist, radiologist, surgeon, and psychiatrist.

RONNEI, ELANOR C., Parents and Hearing Handicapped Children, *Hearing News*, 17 (July 1949).18-22.

Ronnei points out that parents have a natural feeling of deep personal injury when they have a handicapped child. The parents' obligations to the child are to: 1. understand this personal feeling of injury, 2. accept the child as he is, 3. understand what is involved in his hearing loss, 4. take time to understand communication needs of the child, 5. secure compensatory education for the child, 6. inform members of family of facts about the child's loss, 7. provide a wholesome position for him in the family unit.

SILVERMAN, S. R., Recent Developments in Hearing Aids, *Journal of Exceptional Children*, 15 (May 1949).235-8.

The hearing aid as an instrument and its relationship to its user is discussed. Auditory training is recommended for all users. A selected bibliography on recent developments in the field is appended.

STEER, H. O., Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Ontario Psychological Association, *Canadian Journal of Psychology*, 3(June 1949).102-3.

As part of the Annual Meeting of the Ontario Psychological Association Miss Ruth Lewis reported on 'Recent Developments in Speech Therapy.' Reference was made to the various approaches described by delegates to the International Congress on Speech and Therapy, and to the need for training and equipping clinical psychologists in this area.

SLAUGHTER, WAYNE B., AND ALLAN GRADIE, Recent Research in Facial Clefts, *Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery*, 4 (July 1949).311-31.

Surgery can and does inhibit normal growth. Surgery poorly timed and poorly executed can do more damage than good in the long run. Interference is directly proportional to the amount of injury to growth centers and to dimunition of blood supply. There must be no unwarranted trauma to soft tissues and no interference with its blood supply. Any fracturing of bone, or stripping of periosteum in the effort to gain approximation is to be avoided if permanent damage to growth sites is not to result.

SMITH, MADORAH E., Measurement of Vocabularies of Young Bilingual Children in Both the Languages Used, *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, (June 1949).74, 305-311.

The author tried to measure vocabulary in both languages used by a group of 30 bilingual children who knew English and Chinese words. The group was found to have below-average-sized vocabulary in both languages.

SMITHSON, DOROTHY, AND HARRIETT M. DUNN, Summer Means Speech, *The Crippled Child*, 27 (July-August 1949).26-7.

The second of two articles telling of a summer camp in which a program of speech, recreation, and socialization are integrated.

THORNELL, WILL C., Intralaryngeal Approach for Arytenoidectomy in Bilateral Abductor Vocal Cord Paralysis, *Transactions of the American*

Academy of Opthalmology and Otolaryngology, (July-August 1949).631-6.

This paper gives the author's reasons for preferring this type of operation, contains drawings of the operation and case studies. The method is also evaluated by other doctors in the field.

WORK, WALTER P., Two-Room Audiometry Set Up for the Otologists Office, *The Laryngoscope*, 59 (May 1949).454-68.

Clinical tests for auditory acuity are subjective—the environment where the test is made should be free of extraneous visual and auditory distractions. At Borden General Hospital, Chickasha, Oklahoma, early in 1948 a two-room project was attempted. In connection with this project, the author discusses the physical and electrical equipment and the standard operating procedures for such a set up and lists its advantages.

WRIGHT, BETTY C., Hearing, A Community Problem, *Transactions American Academy of Opthalmology and Otolaryngology*, (May-June 1949).563-6.

The author reviews the work, the needs, and the purposes of the American Hearing Society.

YEDINACK, JEANETTE G., A Study of the Linguistic Functions of Children with Articulation and Reading Disabilities, *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 74 (March 1949).23-59.

Second grade children with articulation problems, and/or reading problems, were given intelligence tests, articulation tests, reading tests, and language development examinations. Articulation and reading defects were found to be coexistent and the author warns educators to teach speech and vocabulary before teaching reading.

NEWS AND NOTES

ROBERT F. RAY, *Editor*

PLANS AND PROGRESS

At Boston University: An adult speech clinic has been established in the School of Public Relations to help students improve speech habits, or correct specific defects. The new department supplements the children's speech clinic. Each clinic is equipped with recording disks, tape recorders, audiometers, and a two-way screen for observation.

At Bowling Green State University: The Ohio Society for Crippled Children and the university are co-sponsors of a new Cerebral Palsy Center. Ages of the first group of children who are undergoing therapy range from four to seven. Miss Adeline McClelland has been named director. The Clinic and Center are housed in the north wing of the $180,000 speech building which was completed last summer.

At Florida State University: The Speech and Hearing Clinic has recently enlarged its staff and moved into new quarters. In addition to Gilbert Tolhurst, who initiated clinical service last year, the staff includes Dean Williams, Jane Wooten, and Stanley Ainsworth. The clinic is now located in quarters which have been remodeled to include offices, clinic rooms, classrooms, a workshop, and a phonetics and recording laboratory. In an annex, a room is under contruction for hearing-testing and hearing-aid evaluation. New curricular offerings include work in audiology as well as advanced courses in speech correction.

At Long Island University: A new Department of Speech and Theatre has been instituted, and offers a major leading to an AB degree in speech and theatre arts. Dennis Brown has been appointed chairman.

At Michigan State College: Equipment is being augmented in all phases of the activities of the Speech Department. This year the department is adding a Maico research audiometer, two new turntables, a Western Electric Console, an R.C.A. playback, and a new 16mm. sound film projector.

At the University of North Dakota: For six weeks in July and August, a summer speech clinic was held for school-age children. Under the direction of Earl L. Miller, a twofold program of instruction and clinical methods designed for teachers, parents, and students was offered.

At Keuka College: An experimental theatre has been organized to provide more students with the opportunity to participate in dramatic activities. Directed by drama majors under the supervision of the Department of Speech and Dramatics, the theatre will act as a talent pool to develop acting technique among students.

At the University of Pittsburgh: The cooperation of two suburban high schools has made it possible for the new Department of Speech to offer students majoring in speech practice teaching in their area of specialization. The program provides for student teachers to observe an experienced teacher and to work out plans and try them out under expert guidance. Student teachers also have opportunities to help with extracurricular activities such as class plays, high school forensics, and debate.

At Texas Christian University: The $1,500,000 Fine Arts Building and Auditorium has been completed, and more than $200,000 worth of equipment has been put into operation. There are no 'departments' in the new building. Quarters and facilities for many phases of work are interspersed throughout the building. Regardless of their major fields, students are given access to all facilities; i.e., drama students may use art equipment for making sets or costumes. The structure is actually three buildings in one. The university auditorium occupies the center portion. Offices, studios and classrooms of the School of Fine Arts surround the auditorium, three stories high, on three sides. The Little Theatre runs along the west end of the building, with a separate entrance on the north.* A one-inch layer of 'dead air space' separates each of these three 'buildings,' augmenting soundproof construction of the walls. The radio studio and control room, a 'scale model' of a national network headquarters, have a complete set-up of RCA equipment of the most recent design. Direct loops lead to each of five Fort Worth broadcast sta-

tions, and the control room facilities can handle two broadcasts simultaneously. Programs can be 'picked up' from the studio itself, the auditorium, the Little Theatre, or any of the various studios throughout the building. An announcer in the studio, a symphony or chorus in the auditorium, a lecturer in the Little Theatre, and a soloist in a music studio, for example, could all participate in a single broadcast, with programming directed from the control room. The auditorium seats 1258 persons, and is acoustically designed for radio broadcasting and transcription. Specially designed equipment enables one suspended microphone to pick up an entire chorus—or symphony without distortion; or even the soloists, chorus, and orchestra of an operatic production. The Little Theatre is built to seat 224 persons, with no person more than 75 feet from the stage. The east wing of the theatre stage and the rear of the auditorium stage are separated by soundproof doors, which can be closed to permit simultaneous use of both stages or opened for movement of sets or equipment. A 'social headquarters,' the Green Room, is a parlor-lounge, directly accessible from wings, auditoriums, dressing rooms, and all other parts of the theatre plant.

AT THE UNITED NATIONS: A lectern which can be automatically adjusted for the convenience and comfort of the speaker is now being used in the Assembly, loaned by Thomas J. Watson of International Business Machines Corporation. Made of mahogany, the lectern can be automatically adjusted by speakers to provide their desired reading distance between eyes and text. Adjustment can be made by remote control if any speaker overlooks it. Indirect illumination from both sides of the lectern reaches the speaker's reading material. An automatic timer can be set so that its face is illuminated by a red light one minute or two minutes before the end of the speaker's allotted time. An electric clock shows the exact time of day. Two microphones, one on the right, and one on the left side of the lectern, pick up the speaker's words as he faces from side to side. A button in the platform permits installation of a signal to other rooms to summon the meeting to reconvene.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN: Two alumni have established awards and provided funds to 'supplement, not replace' current university expenditures for intercollegiate forensics. Theodore Herfurth, class of 1894, endowed a $100 award to be given annually to the senior or junior student who has for two years made the greatest contribution to forensics. Harry W. Adams, class of 1900, gave $2,500 for the year 1949-50 and a like amount for 1950-51. From this fund two $250 scholarships have been granted to students needing financial assistance to remain in school. The Hesperia literary society, to which Mr. Adams belonged, is to receive $500. The remainder is to be spent for books, sending debate and discussion teams to appear before Wisconsin audiences, and special forensic events.

APPOINTMENTS

AT ALBION COLLEGE: Otis J. Aggertt has joined the department as instructor in speech. Gretchen Wright has been named speech correctionist. She will also direct the correction program in the Albion public schools.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA: James D. Lambert was appointed to the speech staff in September. He is in charge of extemporaneous speaking and impromptu speaking, and is also teaching sections of the fundamental courses. Dorothy Remley, on leave from MacMurray College, has been appointed lecturer in speech.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS: H. Preston Magruder has been appointed technical director of the theatre.

AT ARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS: New members on the staff include: Mary Elizabeth Peebles, John Kiernan, and Rose Feilbach. Miss Feilbach has been serving as executive secretary to the Washington Hearing Society.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA: Anthony Ostroff, formerly of Northwestern University, has been appointed lecturer in the Department of Speech.

AT CHICO STATE COLLEGE: New staff members include: Allan E. Forbes, assistant professor and head of the Speech Department; Garrett L. Starmer, formerly a student at the University of Utah, now director of radio; Lloyd Jones, director of dramatic productions, and James Wells, who has been put in charge of the forensic program.

AT FREDONIA STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE: Solomon Simonson will head the Department of Speech. Since 1946 he has been directing graduate work in rhetoric and oratory at the University of Denver. Edmund Gress has been added to the staff to supervise the speech laboratory and clinic.

At Louisiana Polytechnic Institute: Ralph Robb, who served as director of debate at Northwestern Louisiana State College, has been appointed acting president.

At Louisiana State University: Don F. Blakely, who taught at Purdue University last year, has been appointed technical director.

At the University of Miami: Eugene White, formerly of Western Reserve University, has been appoined associate professor in the Speech Department.

At Michigan State College: Clair R. Tettemer has been chosen to supervise the audio-visual aids work in the Department of Speech, Dramatics, and Radio Education. During the war, Dr. Tettemer was supervisor of the army radio stations in the Pacific area. Harold Niven has accepted the position at technical director for the Michigan State College Theatres. Frederick Alexander has been appointed to the speech staff.

At Middlebury College: William J. Martin, a director of the Sturbridge, Massachusetts, Summer Theatre, has joined the speech faculty.

At New York University, University College: Harry Muheim has been appointed instructor in speech and will teach beginning courses in public speaking. John Herder from Rutgers University is now coaching the varsity debate team.

At the University of North Dakota: Andrew J. Kochman, Jr., has been named acting head of the Department of Speech. Two new instructors are Quentin W. Welty and L. Fernald Foster.

At Purdue University: Theodore D. Hanley has been appoined assistant professor of voice science. In addition to teaching duties, he will supervise research on voice communications being conducted for the U.S. Navy. The following new instructors have been added to the speech staff: Thomas L. Dahle from the University of Wisconsin; Richard L. Dean from Louisiana State University; Robert F. Duffey from the University of Wisconsin; and Allen D. Fletcher from Stanford University. John H. Glade has been appointed as teaching assistant in the Speech Department and chief announcer for Radio Station WBAA.

At Queens College: Mardel Ogilvie has been named assistant professor in speech education. Formerly professor of English at Fredonia State Teachers College, she was president of the New York State Teachers Association from 1943 to 1945. Giraud Chester has joined the Speech Department as assistant professor, specializing in the field of radio and television.

At Syracuse University: J. Calvin Callaghan has been named chairman of rhetoric and public address. Inez B. Goss, Carole Branley, Mary Heritage, and George Miller have joined the speech faculty.

At the University of Texas: William G. Wolfe of the University of North Carolina joined the speech staff for the summer and remained as a member of the College of Education to handle courses for handicapped children.

ON THE STAGES

At University of Arkansas: The season's play schedule opened with 'The Great Big Doorstep' in October, 'The Glass Menagerie' in November, 'The Old Maid and the Thief' and 'The Telephone' in December. Second semester productions will include 'Taming of the Shrew,' 'Pygmalion,' and 'Anatol.'

At Bowling Green State University: 'Bartered Bride will be the first presentation during the second semester, followed by 'Outward Bound' and 'Twelfth Night.'

At Florida State University: The Drama Department, under the direction of George McCalmon, began its season in November with a production of 'The Male Animal.' The program for the year includes three additional major productions with offerings from Molière, Euripides, and Shakespeare.

At Long Island University: An in-the-round production of Shakespeare's 'Taming of the Shrew' was staged for three weeks in November. Edith Simmons, professional actress, was guest-player in the role of Kate. Dennis Brown directed the production.

At Louisiana State University: An original three-act play entitled 'Escape from Shadows,' written by Charlotte Searles of the Radio Station WLSU staff, was presented as the major production of the summer session.

At Marietta College: The first production by the Drama Department was presented in late October with Ruth Wilcox directing 'Yes, My Darling Daughter.' Willard Friederich directed the second show, 'Guest in the House.' The rest of the schedule includes collaborative

offerings of the Drama and Music Departments, 'Down in the Valley,' 'Shadow and Substance,' 'Trojan Women,' and 'Pierre Patelin.'

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA: An outdoor production of 'Noah' by Andre Obey was the summer session play of the Dakota Playmakers. The 1949-50 playbill includes 'The Late Christopher Bean,' 'Love for Love,' and 'Antigone.'

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH: Schedule for the Pitt Players includes: 'Arsenic and Old Lace'; 'Caste,' by T. W. Robertson; 'Julius Caesar'; and on May 18, 19, 20, 25, and 26, a Broadway musicale, title to be announced. All of the productions are directed by Harvey J. Pope.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN: The Wisconsin Players' 1949-50 season was opened with 'The Devil's Disciple,' written by Shaw and directed by Jonathan Curvin. In November 'Awake and Sing,' by Odets, was directed by John Dietrich. February plays offered will include: 'Soul of a Professor,' by Martin Sampson, and 'Still Life' by Noel Coward. In March the romantic comedy, 'The Swan' by Molnar, will be directed by Fredrick A. Buerki.

AT THE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER: Thornton Wilder will play the part of the stage manager in his own play, 'Our Town,' scheduled for production in May.

AT THE MEETINGS

ARKANSAS SPEECH TEACHERS ASSOCIATION: New officers elected for 1949-50 are: Leona Scott, Arkansas State Teachers College, president, and Doris Hammett, Arkansas College, treasurer.

CENTRAL STATES SPEECH ASSOCIATION: The 1950 conference will be held April 14 and 15 at the Deshler-Wallick Hotel, Columbus, Ohio. Every person interested in any phase of speech is urged to attend. This invitation is directed to all speech teachers in the Central States area and to any others desiring to come, particularly those from the Eastern and Southern Association states bordering Ohio.

The mid-century is a time for evaluation and planning. Speech has attained full academic acceptance in the first half of the century. What will develop in the coming years? The conference will observe the trends, and make plans toward the future. A recent and significant development in the CSSA is the publication of the *Central States Speech Journal*. All members of the Association are entitled to receive it, and those wishing to subscribe should write to William Sattler, University of Michigan, or Lionel Crocker, Editor, Denison University, Granville, Ohio.

Other members of the executive committee to whom inquiries regarding the Association or conference may be addressed are: Paul Moore, Northwestern University; John M. Martin, Oakwood High School, Dayton, Ohio; Leroy T. Laase, University of Nebraska; and John M. Black, Ohio State University.

EASTERN PUBLIC SPEAKING CONFERENCE: This year's meeting will be held in New York, April 13, 14, and 15. Information about it may be obtained by writing Agnes Allardyce, Syracuse University, president of the conference.

FLORIDA SPEECH ASSOCIATION: Held in Jacksonville October 28 and 29, the principal address was delivered by Clarence Edney, head of the Speech Department of Florida State University. Taking as his theme the statement that 'Freedom of expression is the heart of a democracy and accurate expression of ideas is its lifeblood,' Edney exhorted his colleagues to teach their students to have 'skillful, inquiring minds . . . and to express ideas clearly and precisely.'

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR IMPROVEMENT OF READING INSTRUCTION: A meeting will be held March 1 at the AASA meeting in Atlantic City, and all interested persons are invited to attend. The group is a professional organization for all who are interested in the teaching of reading. Its membership consists of leading authorities in the field of reading, instructors who are giving college courses in reading, public school administrators and supervisiors, teachers who are teaching reading in the public schools at all levels from first grade through secondary school, and parents. The main address at the meeting will be offered by Emmett A. Betts, professor of psychology and director of the Reading Clinic, Temple University. Nila Banton Smith, president of the organization, will preside.

IOWA INTERCOLLEGIATE SPEECH CONFERENCE: The fifth post-war conference on world problems was held December 4 at the State University of Iowa, with a parliamentary session including all conference participants. The group met as a legislative body to consider resolutions prepared during the discussion periods. Conference discussion centered around the United States foreign relations with the Far East. Northwestern University was rated highest in

affirmative debate. Teams from Wisconsin, Wichita, Oklahoma, and Kansas tied in negative debate. Ellsworth Kalas, Wisconsin, was rated superior in extemporaneous speaking. Nancy Gossage, Northwestern, and William Paul, Oklahoma, were judged superior public speakers. Bert Tollefson, South Dakota, was placed in the superior division in after-dinner speaking.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE ON SPEECH EDUCATION: The fifteenth annual conference was held in June with Gordon E. Peterson, research expert in Bell Telephone Laboratories, as speaker. Dr. Peterson spoke on a series of subjects in audiology, and demonstrated the spectrograph or visible speech machine with which experimentation is under way in the laboratories.

LOUISIANA SPEECH AND HEARING ASSOCIATION: New officers are Lou Kennedy, director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at Louisiana State University, president; and Quintilla Anders Lewis, speech clinician in Ascension Parish, secretary.

PACIFIC SPEECH CONFERENCE: Three hundred and fifty persons registered at the second annual speech meeting, and were greeted by an address of welcome by K. C. Leebrick, acting president. His speech was followed by one given by Joseph F. Smith, chairman of the speech department at the University of Hawaii, on good speech as the permanent goal of the conference. Gladys Borchers presented an outline guide for a curriculum in speech, and Claude Wise spoke on the problems of dialect. John Highlander discussed the value of radio as an educational medium, pointing out the accomplishments of stations like WHA in Wisconsin and that at the University of Iowa. Riley Allen made a plea for greater recognition of achievement in speech skill.

THE WESTERN SPEECH ASSOCIATION CONVENTION: Speech teachers from the eleven western states met in San Jose, California, for the eighteenth annual convention on November 24, 25, 26. From every standpoint it was considered to be one of the most satisfying and successful conventions of the Association. The records showed an attendance of 375 people from the area bounded by Arizona on the south, Washington on the north, and Colorado on the east. Seventy western colleges and universities were represented. Most encouraging was the report that the total membership of the Association has risen during the past year from 380 to 518, of which 164 are sustaining members. The Speech Tournament filled the three days preceding the convention. R. D. Mahaffey, speech activities coordinator, reported that over four hundred contestants participated on Stanford's campus. The Executive Council reorganized the structure of the organization to meet the demands of growth and the need for greater stability. One important change provides that officers be nominated one year in advance, during which time they will serve as assistants. It is believed that this training period will allow for a more satisfactory continuity of effort. Members of the Executive Council were: president, Virgil A. Anderson; vice-president, Susie S. Niles; executive secretary, Win W. Bird; editor of *Western Speech*, William B. McCoard; speech activities coordinator, R. D. Mahaffey; custodian of records, W. Arthur Cable; councilors, Kathleen Pendergast, Mary Wooley, Helen Nelson, Lyman Partridge, Roy C. McCall, and Joseph Baccus.

At the annual Thanksgiving banquet high honors were paid to Lee Emerson Bassett, professor emeritus of Stanford University, past president of the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, and past president of the Western Speech Association. Short speeches of greeting to the Western Speech Association were given by Hubert C. Heffner (president AETA), Horace G. Rahskopf (first vice-president, SAA), and Lee Edward Travis (past president, ASHA), after which toastmaster Gerald E. Marsh introduced Mr. Bassett as the speaker of the evening. A standing ovation greeted Mr. Bassett as he recounted his experiences in speech in the transition 'From Doghouse to Doctorate.' At the first general session, held Thursday afternoon, President Virgil Anderson presented his report; Dean James C. DeVoss, of San Jose State College, gave the address of welcome; E. J. West, University of Colorado, spoke on 'Educational Theatre, 1919—Retrospect and Prospect'; Seth Fessenden, University of Denver, reported 'The Role of Speech in Group Development'; S. J. Crandell, State College of Washington, presented his views on the role of the teacher of public address; and Sara Stinchfield Hawk, Scripps College, reported her study 'Speech Development and Intelligence in Average and Exceptional Children.' The sectional meetings began Friday morning. *Speech Curriculum*: Chairman Lyman W. Partridge, Central Washington College of Education, presented Waldo Phelps, University of California at Los Angeles, who spoke on 'Current Status of Speech Education in Public High Schools in California.' This was followed by a panel discussion. The mem-

bers of the panel were Edith Beckman, Susie Niles, and Kathleen Pendergast. *Graduate Studies:* As chairman of this section, Roy C. McCall, University of Oregon, introduced the following speakers: Donald Hargis, University of California, Los Angeles, 'To Write or Not to Write a Thesis'; Herold Lillywhite, Whittier College, 'Who Shall Become Candidates?'; Howard Runion, College of the Pacific, 'What Kinds of Courses Shall Graduate Students Take?'; S. J. Crandell, State College of Washington, 'The Graduate Program for Prospective Teachers'; and Milton Dickens, University of Southern California, 'Report of the Committee on Graduate Studies, WSA.' *Speech Sciences:* Wallace A. Goates, University of Utah, was the chairman for this section. Norman W. Freestone, Occidental College, spoke on 'Voice Science and the Fundamentals Course'; Dean G. Nichols, University of Wyoming, presented 'The Use of Palatography in the Diagnosis and Treatment of Articulatory Defects'; Hays A. Newby, Stanford University, spoke on 'The Pre-fenestration Audiometric Survey'; 'A Preliminary Study of Speech Deterioration under Complete Binaural Masking' was presented by Kenneth S. Wood, University of Oregon; Fred M. Chreist, University of New Mexico, discussed 'Some Problems of Phonemic Discrimination in Relation to Language Backgrounds'; and the final speech in this series was given by W. Arthur Cable, University of Arizona, 'Two Practical Problems in a Working System of English Phonetics.' *Speech in Adult Education* was discussed for the first time this year in a WSA convention. William B. McCoard, University of Southern California, was chairman of this section and introduced the following speakers: Granville Basye, College of the Pacific, read a paper prepared by Wyne Porter, Rio Hondo, California, who was unable to attend the meeting. His topic was 'A Development in Self-Help: Toastmasters International.' Charles M. Simmons, San Francisco, gave 'A Report on the Simmons Institute of Human Relations'; and Charles Lomas, University of California, Los Angeles, discussed 'What's Happening in Night-School—The University Extension Programs.' Lee Emerson Bassett, professor emeritus, Stanford University, and Louis Dematteis, district attorney, San Mateo County, California, gave their comments and suggestions on the speeches as well as on the general topic.

The second series of sectional meetings occupied the latter half of Friday morning. *Theatre Arts (College and University):* Theodore Hatlen, University of California, Santa Barbara College, introduced the following topic for panel discussion: 'What is the Place of the University and College Theatre in General Education?' The panel members were Theodore O. H. Karl, Pacific Lutheran College; J. Fenton McKenna, San Francisco State College; Jack Morrison, University of California, Los Angeles; T. Earl Pardoe, Brigham Young University; and Horace Robinson, University of Oregon. *Western Public Address:* Upton Palmer, University of California, Santa Barbara College, was the chairman of this section, and the speakers were as follows: Leland T. Chapin, Stanford University, 'The Western United States as an Area for Research in Public Address'; S. M. Vinocour, University of Washington, 'The Future of Western Public Address'; E. Ray Nichols, Jr., University of Oregon, 'Hiram Johnson: the Man Whom the People Believed'; Donald E. Hargis, University of California, Los Angeles, 'David C. Broderick: Pioneer Senator.' *Speech Correction (Elementary and Secondary Schools):* Chairman Leon Lassers introduced the panel discussion topic, 'The Stutterer in Our Public Schools: How Can We Help Him Most Effectively?' Panel members and their specific topics were Ruth W. Brace, Contra Costa County Public Schools, 'Group Therapy Through Creative Outlets'; James Carrell, University of Washington, 'Choice of a Basic Approach'; Ruth M. Clark, University of Denver, 'Group Therapy'; Margaret Letzter, San Jose State College, 'Sanity in Stuttering Therapy'; Susie S. Niles, Salt Lake City Public Schools, 'Significance and Use of Recordings of Stutterers' Speech'; Alma Wedberg, Los Angeles County Public Schools, 'Tensions in the Stutterer in the Primary Grades: Diagnosis and Therapy'; Kenneth S. Wood, 'Modification of the Stutterer's Home Environment.' The speeches were followed by questions and discussion from the audience as well as discussion among the panel members. *Oral Interpretation:* Alethea Smith Mattingly, University of Arizona, was chairman of this section and discussed 'Why Interpretation?' The other speakers were Martin P. Andersen, University of California, Los Angeles, 'Interpretation and the Department of Speech'; Louise Hill Howe, University of Utah, 'Interpretation and Radio'; T. Earl Pardoe, Brigham Young University, 'Interpretation and Theatre'; Mary Margaret Robb, University of Colorado, 'Interpretation and English'; Garff B. Wilson, University of California, Berkeley, 'Interpretation and General Education.' Helene Blattner, Stanford University, led the discussion following the speeches.

Friday afternoon was also filled with sectional meetings. *Voice and Diction:* Chairman Elise Hahn, University of California, Los Angeles, introduced Dorothy Campion Johnson, Stanford University, who reported on her study 'A Survey of Voice and Diction Training in American Colleges and Universities.' This was followed by a panel discussion on 'The Goals in Voice Training,' with discussion by Horace G. Rahskopf, University of Washington; William B. McCoard, University of Southern California; Wilda M. Merritt, San Jose State College; and Ward Rasmus, San Jose State College, as well as discussion from the floor. *Public Address:* Leland T. Chapin, chairman, Stanford University, presented the topic for a panel discussion, 'What Place Has the History and Criticism of Public Address in the Advanced Public Speaking Classes of the Undergraduate College?' Panel members were Robert E. Allen, University of New Mexico; Marie Carr, San Jose State College; James G. Emerson, Stanford University; Charles W. Lomas, University of California, Los Angeles; and Louis W. Sandine, State College of Washington. *Speech Curriculum (College and University):* Herold Lillywhite, Whittier College, was chairman of this section whose participants were Paul Smith, Pasadena City College, 'What Are the Speech Needs of the Beginning College Speech Students?'; John C. Snidecor, Santa Barbara College, University of California, 'The Speech Major in the General College Curriculum'; Albert Mitchell, University of Utah, 'The Communications Course in the College Curriculum'; Klonda Lynn, University of Arizona, 'Certification and Credential Requirements in the Western States'; and Granville Basye, College of the Pacific, 'Curriculum Requirements in Speech for Teacher Candidates in Western Colleges and Universities.' *Drama (Elementary and Secondary Schools):* A panel discussion, 'Dramatic Arts in the Elementary and Secondary School: A Progress Report,' was introduced by Chairman George Wilson, Hayward Union High School, Hayward, California. Panel members were Roberta Bloomquist, Klamath Falls High School, Klamath Falls, Oregon; Edward Bode, Tamalpais High School, Tamalpais, California; Elizabeth Curinsky, David Starr Jordan, Junior High School, Palo Alto, California; Josephine Tanghe, Bret Harte Elementary School, Hayward, California; and Lola F. Tweedle, Fremont High School, Oakland, California.

The final group of sectional meetings occupied the remainder of Friday afternoon. *The Fundamental Course(s):* 'What Should Be Involved in the Fundamentals Course, or Courses, in Speech?' was the topic introduced by Chairman Earl W. Wells, Oregon State College, and discussed by a panel consisting of Amanda J. Anderson, Salem High School, Salem, Oregon; J. Richard Bietry, East Los Angeles City College; Thorrel B. Fest, University of Colorado; Evelyn Kenesson, Santa Barbara College, University of California; Lawrence H. Mouat, San Jose State College; Horace G. Rahskopf, University of Washington; and Louis W. Sandine, State College of Washington. Members of the audience also participated in the discussion. *Radio and Television:* Chairman Edgar E. Willis, San Jose State College, introduced the following program: 'Radio and Television in Our Future,' Stanley T. Donner, Stanford University; 'The College Radio IQ,' Harold M. Livingston, Oregon State College; 'High School Radio Broadcasting over Commercial Stations,' Raymond F. Kendall, Abraham Lincoln High School, San Jose; 'Television—Its Challenge to Education,' William H. Sener, University of Southern California. *Speech Correction (College and University):* Norman Wm. Freestone, Occidental College, was chairman of this section, and the speakers were as follows: Jack L. Bangs, University of Washington, 'The Measurement of Hearing in Young Children'; Wallace Goates, University of Utah, 'Rationale for a Clinic Procedure'; Lee Edward Travis, University of Southern California, 'Understanding the Stutterer Through Projective Techniques.' *The Reading Hour* was a lecture-recital under the direction of Aurora M. Quiros, University of California, Berkeley. The topic was 'Interpretation vs. Impersonation: An Old Problem Reviewed in the Light of Present Trends in the Field of Oral Interpretation.' The topic was illustrated by readings of various types of material by members of the faculty and students, Department of Speech, University of California, Berkeley: Ann Sullivan, Richard R. Rossman, Kathleen E. Sullivan, Garff B. Wilson, and Gerald E. Marsh.

On Friday evening, those attending the convention were invited to the San Jose State College production of 'Faust, Part I,' by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, in the San Jose State College Little Theatre.

The final General Session of the convention was held on Saturday morning under the direction of Charles F. Lindsley, Occidental College. There was a panel discussion of 'Speech Challenges'; specifically: How can we make the most practical use of voice and speech recordings? Are we placing too much emphasis on the con-

cept of speech as personality? Is it more practical in the basic courses to use phonetic symbols or diacritical marks in presenting the subject of enunciation and pronunciation? What constitutes a sound method of grading in speech and drama work? The panel members were Harlen Adams, Chico State College; Joseph Baccus, University of Redlands; Albert L. Franzke, University of Washington; Hugh Gillis, San Jose State College; Elvena Miller, Seattle Public Schools; W. Charles Redding, University of Southern California; Helen Schrader, Stanford University; John W. Wright, Fresno State College.

At the final business meeting on Saturday morning, changes in the constitution were presented and ratified. One important change is the provision for first and second vice-presidents. The first vice-president shall prepare the convention program and shall automatically be the nominee for president on the following year. The second vice-president shall be, ex officio, chairman of the Standing Committee on Membership. Another important change is that, after next year, all officers shall assume office on the second January following their election. New officers were nominated and elected. Executive Council for 1950 will be: *president*, Norman W. Freestone, Occidental College; *first vice-president*, Roy D. Mahaffey, Linfield College; *second vice-president*, Milton Dickens, University of Southern California; *executive-secretary*, Lawrence H. Mouat, San Jose State College; *editor of Western Speech*, William B. McCoard, University of Southern California; *business manager of Western Speech*, Lorin Jex, Brigham Young University; *speech activities coordinator*, R. D. Mahaffey; *custodian of records*, W. Arthur Cable, University of Arizona; *elementary councilor*, Kathleen Pendergast, Seattle Public Schools; *high school councilor*, Amanda Anderson, Salem High School; *junior college councilor*, Lyle Sieverson, Compton Junior College; *teacher training councilor*, Upton Palmer, Central Washington College of Education; *university and college councilor*, Roy C. McCall, University of Oregon; *past president*, Virgil A. Anderson, Stanford University.

President Virgil Anderson presided at the Association luncheon, Saturday noon. The speaker was John W. Dodds, professor of English and director of special programs in humanities, Stanford University, who discussed 'The Place and Function of Communication in a Liberal Education.' The business meeting of the Old and New Executive Council concluded the convention.

(Reported by William B. McCoard, University of Southern California.)

THE WISCONISN SPEECH ASSOCIATION: A luncheon opened the meeting held in Milwaukee, November 4. Karl R. Wallace addressed a joint session on the subject, 'The Basic Requirements and Methods of the High School Teacher of Speech.' In one sectional meeting following the main address, Marquette University and the University of Wisconsin debated the high school question; and in the other, five brief papers were presented on the general topic, 'The High School Forensic Program.' Frederick W. Haberman is president of the association.

PERSONAL NOTES

AT ALBION COLLEGE: James W. Brock, assistant professor of speech, who was on leave last year to work on his doctorate at Northwestern, has returned to the campus and assumed direction of the Albion Players.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA: Edward Barnhart, assistant professor of speech and lecturer in psychology, has been awarded a Guggenheim scholarship and is on leave from the university to study propaganda in the general election in England.

AT LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY: G. W. Gray, professor of speech, taught at the University of California's summer session.

AT MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE: Joe Callaway, director of radio education, has returned to his duties after sabbatical leave for a year. Three months of the year were spent on a transcontinental lecture tour, and during the last three-quarters of the year he visited the radio and television stations in the Scandinavian countries, Italy, France, Germany, Switzerland, England, Ireland, Belgium, and Holland. Among other interesting experiences he handled the broadcast to this country from the UNESCO Conference on Adult Education held in Copenhagen. He also broadcast to this country from Paris and London. While in Germany he lectured to students at the free University of Berlin and was asked to be the first lecturer at the new American House.

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA: John S. Penn, associate professor of speech and head of the Speech Department, has been granted a year's leave of absence to study at the University of Wisconsin.

At Pasadena College: James H. Jackson, an alumnus who has been in pastoral work, has joined the faculty and will direct the forensic program.

At Purdue University: Earl R. Harlan and Ralph C. Lawson have been promoted to the rank of assistant professor of speech. Ross D. Smith was promoted to rank of assistant professor of dramatics.

Richard Dean, who completed the master's degree in August at Louisiana State University, is teaching at Purdue University.

At the University of Pittsburgh: Promotions include Fred Robie and Harvey J. Pope from the rank of instructor to that of assistant professor.

William Ellis, who completed work for the master's degree in August at Louisiana State, is teaching at the University of Nebraska.

At San Jose State College: James H. Clancy, associate professor of speech, is taking a year's leave of absence to study abroad.

At Stanford University: Promotions include Léland T. Chapin from associate professor to professor; Helen W. Schrader from instructor to assistant professor; and H. Donald Winbigler to professor of speech and education.
sor of dramatics.

At Syracuse University: R. L. Irwin, head of the Speech Arts Department, has been promoted to the rank of associate professor.

At the University of Wisconsin: Recent Ph.D. graduates are Bernard Anderson, J. Calvin Callaghan, and William B. Whitaker. T. J. McLaughlin has been appointed instructor in speech.

OBITUARY

Garrett Leverton, theatrical editor of Samuel French, Inc., died following a heart attack on November 11 in his New York home. He was 52 years old. Formerly head of the drama department at Northwestern University, he had been with Samuel French for twelve years. From 1946 to 1948 he taught playwriting at Columbia University.